
R G B WH GR BL
Grey Scale #13
C M Y K
DANES-PICTA.COM
A 1 2 3 4 5 6 M 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 B 17 18 19
Colour Chart #13
Blue
Cyan
Green
Yellow
Red
Magenta
White
3/Color
Black
Inches
Centimetres
DANES-PICTA.COM

McGRAW-HILL SERIES IN EDUCATION
HAROLD BENJAMIN, Consulting Editor

Education for Democracy in Our Time

McGraw-Hill
Series in Education

HAROLD BENJAMIN
CONSULTING EDITOR

The Stanford University Education Faculty—THE CHALLENGE OF EDUCATION

Bowden and Melbo—SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF EDUCATION

Broom—EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENTS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Brubacher—MODERN PHILOSOPHIES OF EDUCATION

Butts—THE COLLEGE CHARTS ITS COURSE

Croxton—SCIENCE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Grinnell—INTERPRETING THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Horrall and Others—LET'S GO TO SCHOOL

Jones, Grizzell and Grinstead—PRINCIPLES OF UNIT CONSTRUCTION

McKown—ACTIVITIES IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Newlon—EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN OUR TIME

Pringle—THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Sears—CITY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS

Thorpe—PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PERSONALITY

Updegraff and Others—PRACTICE IN PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

Wert—EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS

Wilson, Stone and Dalrymple—TEACHING THE NEW ARITHMETIC

Winslow—THE INTEGRATED SCHOOL ART PROGRAM

368 B11

BIBLIOTEKA
Miasta Odry Adm. Pub.
939
Nr.....

Education for Democracy in Our Time

BY

JESSE H. NEWLON

Professor of Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

First Edition

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, Inc.
NEW YORK AND LONDON
1939

37

COPYRIGHT, 1939, BY THE
McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

All rights reserved. This book, or parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without permission of the publishers.

34084/2





THE MAPLE PRESS COMPANY, YORK, PA.

To

C. B. N.

and

L. H. N.

PREFACE

THE manuscript of this book was in the hands of the publisher prior to the outbreak of the European war at the beginning of September, but a careful reading revealed that only slight changes needed to be made in the text. The actual outbreak of war was but the logical culmination of a situation that had been developing for years.

As this is written, it is still impossible to know how long the war will last or what nations will be involved. A portentous shift in the world balance of power is taking place, but what the new alignments are to be is not yet clear. Some things are, however, perfectly clear. Democracy is engaged in a fateful struggle with the forces of reaction. All the values of democracy, all the values of our ethical and religious tradition and of religious toleration, all the humanitarian values which we prize, all of the values of intellectual freedom are in serious jeopardy in the contemporary world. The defense and fuller realization of the values of democracy and liberalism are dependent on an economic reconstruction everywhere that will ensure security and freedom for all. We hope that our own country will not become involved in the war, but we cannot evade the stark and brutal reality that a world dominated by autocracies, whether of the right or the left, would be a world in which none of us would want to live.

The present world situation places enormous responsibilities on American education. The actual beginning of war throws into bolder relief the analyses and the theses

presented in this book. A prolonged war, which might become a second world war, would inevitably accentuate and make far more insistent the problems of democracy in this country. War, even when unavoidable and waged only in defense, places terrific strains on the institutions of democracy. Cool heads and the highest courage will be demanded in the years that lie immediately ahead.

There is much that is encouraging in the current educational scene in this country, but also much confusion growing out of the uncertainties of an age of profound social change and transition. We need to clarify our conceptions of social objectives and of the social and educational methods appropriate to their realization. This calls for an analysis of the social scene and of the educational implications of significant proposals for economic and social reconstruction. There is no other place to begin. Educators, by the very social nature of their task, must make this analysis on the basis of the most authoritative information and interpretations available to them from the social sciences and from their own observation and experiences.

To be effective a democratic educational philosophy must operate in every phase of the educational enterprise. I have, therefore, tried to examine in these pages some of the most critical problems of policy which teachers and administrators are today encountering and with which those who are preparing to enter the teaching profession will soon be confronted. I have written out of a conviction that grows stronger every year that in the future the teachers of the country must play a more important role, not only in shaping educational policy, but in all of our civic and social life.

I wish to express my appreciation of the interest of Dean William F. Russell who made it possible for me to

have the time to write this book. I am greatly indebted to my secretary, Mrs. Catherine Stolle, without whose competent assistance in many ways this manuscript would never have been brought to a conclusion. Dr. A. L. Threlkeld, and my colleagues, Professors George D. Strayer, John K. Norton, Willard Elsbree, and Merle Curti, with whom I have had the privilege of discussing many of the problems considered in these pages, have contributed much to my thinking. Professors Elsbree, Norton, and Curti read the manuscript and made valuable criticisms and suggestions. To these and other friends I am grateful. I wish to express my especial appreciation to my colleagues, John L. Childs and George S. Counts, who read the manuscript and made many helpful criticisms and suggestions. To these friends, with whom I have had for many years the privilege of discussing intimately the problems of contemporary society and education, I am deeply indebted for many social and educational insights. But for the analysis made and the views expressed in these pages I am solely responsible.

JESSE H. NEWLON.

TEACHERS COLLEGE,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
October, 1939.

CONTENTS

PREFACE vii

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION xiii

CHAPTER I
EDUCATION IN AN AGE OF UNCERTAINTY 3

CHAPTER II
THE NATURE OF THE SOCIAL CRISIS 18

CHAPTER III
THE PROMISE OF AMERICAN LIFE 39

CHAPTER IV
MEANS AND ENDS 52

CHAPTER V
EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN OUR TIME 81

CHAPTER VI
A SOCIAL PROGRAM FOR THE AMERICAN SCHOOL 104

CHAPTER VII
CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION 126

CHAPTER VIII
EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY 150

CHAPTER IX
A SOCIAL PROGRAM FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION . . . 171

CHAPTER X
EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY . 203

INDEX 231

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

IN THE story of human experience, there occurs no more striking phenomenon than that which begins in the practice of primitive magic and ends in the processes of modern technology. Man's attempts to control the forces of nature have passed through four main stages. There was first the stage of reliance upon a general hocus-pocus presumed to have universal power. The medicine man who possessed this all-potent *wakan* was not bound by the exigencies of time, place, or condition in the practice of his craft. His medicine was big medicine here or there, yesterday or tomorrow, equally good for the crises of war or the cramps of colic.

But an all-purpose magic was soon found to be seriously wanting. There were too many cases in which it did not work. Observant and conscientious medicine men therefore began to mix healing herbs with their chants and exorcisms. They began to seek control over natural phenomena by the long, hard route of study and understanding instead of by the short-cut way of direct command and entreaty. They entered upon the second stage where they were still largely magicians, but magicians who used science to support their wizardry.

The new combination was soon seen to be little better than the old dosage of straight magic, however. Intelligent men began to wonder whether more effective results might not be obtained by discarding magic altogether and pinning their whole faith on empirically observed and rationally interpreted facts. Thus they

passed into a third stage, in which they became mainly technologists. They wondered, they looked, they tried, they looked again, they wondered once more. Always they came back to that process of wondering, and then they found that they could not wonder pointedly and fruitfully without some basic notions very like the old short-cut magic. They had to have a philosophy. They sought for it in their magic past, and so they became modern scientists in much of what they did and primitive medicine men in much of why they did it.

The final stage is hard to achieve. Men enter upon it when they move the basis of their wondering as well as the sources of their looking and doing up into the present era. Then they become physicians who search purposefully for the germ cause of a disease instead of letting the patient's blood with great technical skill for reasons uncritically derived from Galen. Then they become engineers who require a cable of a certain tensile strength because they have computed here and now the strain that cable must withstand rather than because some dictum maker of the past claimed that all cables must have weight proportional to their loads.

The practice and theory—the doing and wondering—of education may still be found today upon all four of these stages. So fluid are the foundations of the craft, indeed, that occasionally an educational medicine man, eager to escape from the toils and worries of trying to find the correct pedagogical herb or to track down the sinning germ in the ills of learners, retreats from the third or second stage to the place where all one needs to do is to have faith in one big magic which will work all the way from the University of Chicago to St. John's College at Annapolis.

There is no doubt as to where the author of the present volume stands. He is an educational theorist who

assails his task upon the fourth level. He has no timeless magic. He is not a compounder of herbs and simples who needs a few incantations to make his potions work. He is no operator who must acquire his reasons from authority or direct revelation. He is one whose philosophy of education is built upon the problems of our own time as well as upon the enduring values of democracy. He cannot find the bases for his wondering in a philosophy that comes from the speculations of other men on other events in other days. He gets it instead from the social crisis that faces him and all his neighbors here and now, from the resources that he and all his neighbors possess among them if they will only reach out and utilize what is their own, and, above everything, from the tools and instruments that he and all his neighbors have at their hands whenever they shall truly want to change their ways for good.

This is a distinguished book, not because the author already bears a distinguished name in American education—although that, of course, is true—but rather because it is a book that comes from facts of the first order, basic facts, facts upon which the new education in America must be founded squarely and, further, because it is erected upon those facts in a thoroughly sincere and workmanlike fashion.

HAROLD BENJAMIN.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND,
October, 1939.



Education for Democracy in Our Time

I

EDUCATION IN AN AGE OF UNCERTAINTY

IN THE fourth decade of the twentieth century we live in one of the most critical periods in modern times, indeed in the whole history of Western civilization. Ours is a time of stress and strain, of confusion and uncertainty, of profound economic and social change. These facts are documented beyond question in the current literature of the social sciences and, more important, in the experience of everyone who has eyes to observe the unprecedented changes wrought by science and technology, the conflict of social forces, and the spirit of aggression in the contemporary world. Every aspect of the culture is affected, every social value and every social institution. Four decades ago the American people looked to the future with highest hope, confident that their dream of happiness and prosperity for all would eventually be realized under a government so democratic and so just and in a country so richly endowed by nature. Today they look to the future with questioning and doubt.

The whole liberal tradition and all the institutions and processes of democracy are under attack in the world today. Never was there a more cataclysmic social overturn than the Russian Revolution. That country

has embarked upon a gigantic effort to build a socialist society, but at the end of twenty years it is uncertain in which direction Russia is moving. In Italy and Central Europe the authoritarian state which negates every principle of democracy has appeared. Hitler and the Nazis have swept on to triumph after triumph. Nor has the United States escaped the economic and social ills of the period. There is every reason to believe that the next generation of Americans will make the most momentous decisions since the Revolutionary War. There is much that is dark and discouraging in the picture, and no one can be sure what the future will reveal. But it is also undoubtedly true that the American people still have the resources to control their own destiny. To mould the future in accordance with the ideals of democracy they must act promptly, resolutely, and with the utmost of intelligence.

Education and Social Uncertainty

American education reflects the tensions and strains, the doubts, and the confusion of this age of drift and uncertainty. Americans have long believed in the beneficial effects of popular education open on fairly equal terms to every individual. In the last generation they have become vaguely aware that a high degree of popular intelligence is essential to the functioning of a complex industrial civilization. More important, they have begun to realize as never before how essential popular education is to the effective functioning of democracy. Moreover, all well-informed citizens have begun to see that a system of popular education is an effective instrument for social control. They have observed how the national systems of education were employed in European countries before the World War, particularly in Germany and France, to foster the

spirit of nationalism that blazed forth in August, 1914. Since the war they have seen the communists in Russia and the fascists in other European countries employing the schools to build loyalty to political and economic ideals and institutions initiated by these new regimes. They have seen popular education employed as an instrument of social revolution.

Education has become a subject of deep concern to Americans. Their interest in education today is probably greater even than it was a century ago, when the battle for free schools was being waged under the leadership of Horace Mann and his contemporaries. There is concern about the adequacy and quality of education available to children and youth, about the cost of public schools, but above all about the social purposes and implications of education and the methods of teaching employed in the schools.

Schools and teachers are now subjected to constant pressures by individuals and groups seeking to control education and direct it to the ends that they respectively approve. This century has seen the enactment of much legislation pertaining to the content of the curriculum. The Tennessee statute forbidding the teaching of evolution and the so-called "Red Rider" forbidding the "teaching" of communism in the schools of the national capital, the latter now happily repealed, are but extreme examples of such legislation. Overt pressures are exerted by various hereditary patriotic societies, veterans' organizations, and sometimes by associations of business men and industrialists to control the study of controversial economic and political issues and of socialism, communism, and other proposals for the reconstruction of economic life. Efforts have been made, on the other hand, and sometimes successfully, to utilize the schools for propaganda for social and moral reforms.

The teachers' loyalty oaths enacted in some twenty-two states have no purpose other than the control of teaching. Freedom of teaching has become an important problem, and was a particularly acute issue during and immediately following the World War and again during the darkest period of the depression. In numerous instances teachers have been driven out of schools and colleges because certain individuals or groups took exception to their treatment of controversial social issues in the classroom or to their political views or activities.

These attempts to control teaching are evidence of the crucial importance of education in the modern world and of the consequences that hang on the purposes and methods that permeate the work of the schools.

The Amazing Growth of the American Schools

The growing concern about education is not surprising when it is considered in the light of the development of popular education in the United States in the last fifty years.

By the turn of the century attendance in the elementary school was compulsory and universal. As early as the seventies of the last century the high school, as the result of several court decisions, was firmly established as a part of the common school system. The number enrolled in public secondary schools in 1890 was less than 250,000, but rapid growth had already begun. Today some six million, 65 per cent or more of youth between fourteen and seventeen years of age, are attending high schools. In no other country are these figures even approached. The first state university was established in North Carolina in 1789. Today every state maintains institutions of college and university grade, and the number privately supported has multiplied

until the total of these institutions is well over a thousand. More than twelve hundred thousand youth are attending American colleges, professional schools, and universities. Recent years have witnessed a marked development of adult education, until now provision of varied educational opportunities for adults is considered an essential function of our system of free schools.

It is an interesting fact that the United States is the only country in the world in which the control and administration of education are subjects of extensive graduate study. This circumstance is explained not only by the magnitude of the problems of support and administration but also by the fact of their social and economic importance and the consequent responsibilities placed on the profession.

This vast system of education is staffed by a million teachers and other professional workers. Its potential power to influence the thinking and the habits of the people is enormous.

The Purposes and Problems of Popular Education

The proponents of popular education and its organizers and leaders in the first half century of our national existence, such as Jefferson, Mann, and Barnard, were deeply interested in the political and social effects of education and saw in the school an agency for the promotion of social enlightenment and progress. The establishment of the principle of free public education coincided with the beginning of the great westward movement and with the advent of modern machinery and industrial processes. In those early days there was much concern about the social purposes of education, but soon educators became engrossed in the vast problems of organization, personnel, and administration connected with the rapidly expanding schools, with the

result that the study of the nature of the educative process and of educational theory developed only slowly, although there was much interest in educational developments abroad. It is not surprising that during a century of unprecedented economic achievement and well-being for the masses, when the poor man could always go west to new land, American educators were inclined to take the existing political, economic, and social system for granted, to become, in fact, staunch and undiscriminating defenders of the *status quo*. Such a man was the able William T. Harris, the most influential educational leader of the latter part of the century. Harris, who was much interested in the theoretical aspects of education, accepted democracy but also, without question, the economic individualism that, although once the economic base of democracy, was soon to generate some of our most serious economic and social problems.

It is probably more than an interesting coincidence that the first serious and extensive interest in the systematic study of educational theory and practice came just as the frontier was being closed. During the nineties the first important group of educational theorists emerged, including the conservative Harris, the democratic and creative Parker, the McMurrys, G. Stanley Hall, De Garmo, and the great pragmatists, William James and the young John Dewey, who began a searching philosophical examination of the social nature and purpose of education. Under the leadership of James E. Russell the graduate study of education was, in this decade, placed on an enduring basis in the American university.

The hard times of the seventies and the serious depression of the nineties, with attendant labor troubles and unrest among the farmers, were recognized by many as indications that the country would eventually be

faced with serious economic problems, and this notwithstanding the renewal of prosperity following the Spanish-American War. These depressions were followed by the first great reform movement in American politics, led by such men as Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt, La Follette, and Woodrow Wilson. Education was affected by all these developments. After a century events were compelling a renewal of interest in the relation of education to social needs and in its fundamental purposes and methods. Education must be made more effective. The schools must assume a much greater responsibility for civic and vocational education in an industrial society growing ever more complicated.

The Scientific Movement in Education

In the attempt to find solutions to the complex educational problems now emerging, there appeared two movements of great significance, the scientific movement and the "progressive education" movement.

The nineteenth century had been a century of astounding scientific and technological achievement. The American people were most enthusiastic over the achievements of science in industry and agriculture and in such fields as medicine. Toward the close of the century the efficiency expert appeared in business. It was inevitable that the scientific method should be applied to the study of the problems of education and that the belief would arise in the minds of many that education could be reduced to a science.

The experimental method had already been introduced into psychological laboratories in European and American universities, with most encouraging results. Psychologists now began to study experimentally the nature of intelligence and of the learning process. In the early years of the century mental measurement was

introduced by Thorndike and others. The possibilities in the intelligence tests developed by the French psychologists Binét and Simon caught the imaginations of American psychologists and were rapidly developed in this country. The new techniques were also utilized for the objective measurement of the progress of pupils in their studies.

Soon scientific and statistical methods were brought to bear on a wide array of problems in the fields of method, content, personnel, organization, supervision, and administration of education. The science of education gained great prestige. The movement for measurement, experimentation, and standardization was under way. Most of the ablest of the younger minds were attracted to it. Research departments were widely established in school systems. The skeptics fought a losing rear-guard action. Indeed, most of the opponents, belonging to the old guard, little understood the newer movements or the social conditions that were producing them. They had not the social and theoretical background and knowledge with which to appraise the scientific movement constructively.

How does this movement appear in the perspective of a generation? The application of the scientific method to the study of educational problems was in reality long overdue and most salutary. Educational policies should be based on realities, on the most exact information obtainable. The introduction and perfection of this method in the field of education has, then, been clear gain. Unfortunately, however, the scientific method was too often employed for the refinement of the processes of the existing school rather than for an examination of the underlying assumptions of this school. Many of the problems studied were of little importance, merely insignificant minutiae. The actual results obtained in

some areas after forty years of effort often seem pitifully small and disappointing.[1] It may be said with truth that the effects were in some respects positively bad. A false hope was held before the ablest minds of the younger generation that the answers to the most critical educational problems could be discovered solely by this method. The social nature and implications of these problems escaped the notice of many engaged in scientific research. Attention was distracted from many basic issues and especially from the study of education in its deeper social relationships. Many of the devotees of the scientific movement became very impatient with theory and in particular with educational philosophy. It is an interesting fact that philosophy of education received but scant attention in some of the most important schools of education.

As the social and economic crisis deepened after the World War, the more thoughtful students of social and educational affairs saw that the most difficult problems simply would not yield to quantitative and statistical methods. Statistical data do not interpret themselves. It cannot be demonstrated by these techniques that controversial social issues should be studied in schools or what issues should be studied or how. It cannot be demonstrated scientifically that the individual should be regarded as the end and not the means of government, that democracy is preferable to fascism. The hope that the problems of education could be solved *solely* by the application of the scientific method proved to be an illusion. The idea that the worth of a program of educa-

[1] See *The Scientific Movement in Education*, Frank N. Freeman *et al.*, the Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Public School Publishing Company, 1938. The reader will be interested to note how little has actually been accomplished by the application of the techniques of this method to such a subject as arithmetic.

tion for democracy can be in any sense finally evaluated by any test other than the test of time is also a dangerous illusion. It is also true that science has given us many techniques of conditioning that can be made to serve the purposes of a dictatorship as well as those of a democracy.

These observations, however, raise questions not of the value of the scientific method but rather of its use and limitations. The scientific method is not only an invaluable but an indispensable instrument for the study of social and educational problems. Only in a democracy can this method be freely and most effectively employed. The methods of science can be wisely used in education only by those who see the problems to be investigated in their broadest and deepest setting and relationships.

The Progressive Education Movement

Americans have a liking for the word "progressive." No one wants to be called unprogressive. The term "progressive" is widely used in political circles. Theodore Roosevelt attempted to found a progressive party. Today each of the old parties has its progressive wing. It was only natural that the word should eventually be applied[1] to a movement in education that had its inception in the last two decades of the nineteenth century in the work of men like Colonel Francis Parker and, later and more fundamentally, in the thought of William James and especially of John Dewey.

The label "progressive" has been applied to a wide variety of ideas and practices, and, although the emphasis of the Progressive Education Association has certainly shifted since its organization, certain broad principles

[1] The designation "progressive education" came into wide usage with the organization of the Progressive Education Association in 1918. The movement antedates this organization by a generation.

and trends have been clearly discernible. This movement has emphasized the worth and uniqueness of the individual, the active and experiential elements in the learning process, and the social nature and social purpose of all education; it has opposed formalism and imposition.

Francis Parker was deeply democratic in his sympathies. While an optimist, he was sensitive to many of the problems of American life and believed the school could educate for good citizenship by practice in the virtues of good citizenship. He made a significant step toward introducing the spirit of democracy into education. The Dewey experimental school of the nineties broke radically with the traditional school, both in theory and practice. It was the break with traditional methods of teaching that was instantly most spectacular and that produced the first profound impression.

The progressive education movement was, in the beginning at least, in large measure a movement of protest against the formalism, the lock step, and the sterility of the curriculum of the old school, but it has always had its positive elements. The role of interest, freedom, activity, and of experience in learning, the needs of "the whole child" and of "integrated personality" are values that have been emphasized by this movement. For a long time the great body of progressive educators was preoccupied with method. In the opinion of many critics the emphasis on child-centered education tended to develop an exaggerated and undisciplined individualism. A few schools went to extremes in the freedom accorded to children and individual teachers. These schools represented the same type of protest in education that has produced some of the more bizarre of the "modernistic" movements in the arts.

But these extremists were never more than a fringe. Gradually the fundamental ideas of this school of thought

began to affect and modify all of education. The school became a much more wholesome and happy place for children. Gradually a more active type of learning began to replace the old *memoriter* methods. Gradually the old subject organization began to give way before a more functional approach to learning. The content of the curriculum was drawn more from the needs of the life about the school. More and more, the community became a laboratory of study. More and more, children and youth managed the life of the school. This movement has undoubtedly been the most creative element in American education since the turn of the century.

For in reality the work of Dewey and other thinkers that gave rise to this educational movement cuts very deep. We can *know* only what we learn and make our own through experience. Science, which is fundamental to this outlook, provides us an instrument for extending and refining our experience. Experimentalism is the philosophy both of science and of democracy. Authoritarianism in the intellectual, the social, and moral realms is rejected. This school of thought is liberal and socially progressive; in the minds of many it has been radical in its social orientation. The problems of American society, the progressives hold, should be studied in the school. Only in this way can education hope to develop in the people the intelligence required to achieve a democratic solution of their problems.

All American schools have been more or less affected both by the scientific and progressive movements. Both these movements have made important contributions, but neither has found the solution to the most difficult problems of education. Many of the most basic questions are still unanswered. Unrest continues, and the struggle for control of the school becomes more evident.

Confusion as to Purpose

This brings us back to our earlier discussion of the effects of the uncertainty and confusion of the period on education. There is no doubt that almost all American teachers and educational administrators are devoted to democracy and that most of them are deeply concerned about its future and the responsibility of education for its preservation. The majority are "liberal" in outlook and sympathy, though they frequently entertain ideas and display attitudes that are in conflict with one another.[1]

In the welter and confusion of the times teachers are told by one school of thought that education can only follow the social consensus, must teach in controversial areas only that which is socially approved. Another school of thought—broadly speaking, the progressive—holds that although society cannot be reconstructed through education alone, education has, nevertheless, a positive and constructive role to play in the improvement of American life and must concern itself with current social problems. One section of the latter school of thought is opposed to all imposition, to all "indoctrination." The concern of the school must be, in their opinion, that children and youth learn to think for themselves. They should learn the habits of toleration and cooperation essential in a democracy. But there must be no imposition of any kind. In its crudest form this doctrine holds that it is the function of education to teach youth to think but not what to think. Another division of this school

[1] William H. Kilpatrick (ed.), *The Teacher and Society*, First Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, D. Appleton-Century, 1937. Note particularly Chap. VIII, the study of teachers' social attitudes by George Hartmann.

of thought holds that education must attempt more forthrightly and directly to build in the individual understanding of the economic and social bearings of democracy today and allegiance to democracy. The central problems are, then, what the social content, method, and direction of education shall be and how the individual may be taught to think for himself in a way that will predispose him toward letting others think for themselves and toward the maintenance and fuller realization of democracy.

Education for Democracy in Our Time

The truth is that the struggle is on everywhere for the control of the minds of youth and of adults. It could not be otherwise in so critical a period of social conflict and transition. In this struggle the control of all agencies of communication is at stake. There is no opinion-forming agency more important than popular education, touching as it does all the people almost literally from the cradle to the grave. No greater issue, then, confronts this country today than the problem of the social purpose for which our schools are to be employed, or of how they can be made to further the purpose of democracy.

It becomes ever more apparent that although education has its enduring elements, it is, nevertheless, always a function of time and place. The educational needs of our country are different today from what they were a hundred and fifty years ago, much more complex, and much more extensive. The great educational necessity of today is for a democratic theory and program of education suitable to the needs of our time. Such a conception, to be of any value, must take account of all the realities in the current social situation. Otherwise it will not be worth the paper it is written on. Obviously such a conception will affect every department of the

educational system, all its functions and practices, and the teachers both as teachers and as citizens. It is inconceivable that a school can serve the purposes of democracy where teaching is democratic and administration is autocratic.

We propose in the chapters that follow to inquire what education for democracy in our time would be. It is clear that this inquiry must begin with a closer examination of the desperate social crisis from which our acute educational problems arise.

ZBIOROWA
Księgozbiorów
Uniwersytet

II

THE NATURE OF THE SOCIAL CRISIS

THE nature of the crisis that grips the world today can be understood only in the perspective of its historical development. The World War marked the end of an epoch, the close of the first era in the economic life of the United States, the era of the Industrial Revolution and of economic individualism.

The invention of the steam engine, of textile machinery, and of the cotton gin at the close of the eighteenth century ushered in an industrial revolution that in a little more than a hundred years was to create a new order. We are still living too close to the nineteenth century to comprehend fully the meaning of the transformation wrought in economic and social life by the technological achievements of this revolution. Manufacture was in large measure transferred from the small shop to great industrial plants. Farming was likewise revolutionized by modern machinery and by a complicated economy. A culture based on agriculture and handicrafts has been transmuted into an industrial and urban civilization. Paradoxical though it may seem, even rural life has been in large measure urbanized.

The nineteenth century witnessed one of the greatest migrations known to history. At the beginning of the century, there were still vast unsettled areas in those regions of the world most favored by climate, soil, forest,

and mineral resources, in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Africa. The most desirable of these lands were settled, exploited, much of their rich resources wasted. The unleashing by new inventions of hitherto undreamed-of productive forces made this century, despite recurring periods of depression, an age of unprecedented material well-being. New industrial empires came into being. The leading industrial nations—England, Germany, the United States, and France—competed for the trade of the world.

This period of material expansion closed with the World War, which was, in large measure, the product of the economic rivalries and imperial interests of the industrial nations. Before the war was over, the old regime had toppled in Russia, and the revolution there had inaugurated the first attempt to build a great socialist state. In one-sixth of the land surface of the world the capitalistic system had been replaced by collective ownership of the instruments of production. Revolutions ushered in republics in Germany, Austria, and other countries between the Baltic and Black Seas. The Treaty of Versailles rearranged the map and created a fringe of new nations in Eastern Europe, including the ill-fated republic of Czechoslovakia.

Today, twenty years after the close of the war, the world is experiencing the worst economic depression in modern times. The republics of Germany and Austria are no more. Austria and Czechoslovakia have been annexed to the Third Reich by Hitler. Germany and Russia have seized and divided Poland. Renascent China has been forced into a cruel war to repel the Japanese invader, who seems to have embarked on a course of Asiatic conquest. The nations have been building armaments such as the world has never known in preparation for the next world conflict. Everywhere democracy is on

the defensive. The peoples are in the grip of a fear that grows out of uncertainty as to what the future holds in store for them.

The Causes of the Crisis

The broad outlines of the causes of this crisis in civilization, for it is just that, are not beyond the comprehension of the millions of well-informed persons in every country today. Studies of this crisis in its various aspects form the subject matter not only of much of the technical literature of the social sciences but of many more popular treatises and of almost countless articles in the more thoughtful periodicals and in the daily press. Attempts either to make the causes seem very obscure or to oversimplify them are nothing more than a part of an economic and political folklore such as has recently been brilliantly delineated in Arnold's *The Folklore of Capitalism*. If the causes and nature of the crisis were beyond the comprehension of the ordinary citizen, the prospects would be dark indeed.

Our purpose is to examine the responsibilities that the crisis imposes on education and educators in a democracy. What follows is, therefore, only by way of summary and analysis of certain aspects of the situation essential to an understanding of the educational problem.

During the latter part of the eighteenth century, as the culmination of forces long at work, the economic, political, and social system based on feudalism, the guild system, and, later on, mercantilism were disintegrating under pressure from the rising entrepreneurs who were demanding that manufacture and commerce be freed from the old restrictions upon them. The period was one of intellectual and political ferment and upheaval, culminating in the American and French Revolutions, in the establishment of the principle of government by consent,

of popular sovereignty, and of those rights of freedom of press, speech, assembly, and of religion that we know as our civil liberties. The American Revolution, which freed us from the economic dominance of the mother country, was much more than a war for independence. It was a profound political, economic, and social revolution. In France, where the old order was overthrown and the church disestablished, republican government was, eighty years later, placed on a strong foundation. Political democracy came in England with the parliamentary reform measures of the eighteen thirties and with the extension of the suffrage and other reforms following the Chartist movement of the next decade. The nineteenth century saw the development and gradual spread to most of the countries of Europe of the principles of liberalism and political democracy.

Economically, this upheaval meant the freeing of trade and industry from the restrictions of the guilds and from the mercantilist system under which commerce was closely controlled and regulated by the Crown or central government through monopolies, navigation laws, and other measures—of the type against which the American colonists revolted. The entrepreneurs of the rising middle class demanded freedom from the guild control of labor and production and, above all, a free market, which was an essential factor in the emerging economic individualism. These profound political and economic changes coincided with the first great impact of the Industrial Revolution and were in considerable measure caused by the new methods of production. With the advent of power machinery, the modern factory system began to replace handicraft methods of manufacture. A new class of wage earners, the industrial workers, came into being.

In the so-called open field of free competition the ruthless and favored tended to crowd out the weak. Govern-

ment was supposed to act only as a policeman to preserve order and punish dishonesty. But with the advent of the modern corporation and of large industrial enterprises the situation did not remain so simple as that. Big business proved more efficient than little business. Many of the captains of modern industry also proved to be robber barons in a new guise. The concentration of financial and industrial power in a relatively few hands went on apace. Monopoly soon appeared in a new form, in the form of trusts and cartels rather than grants by the Crown. Under pressure from the middle class and labor, government began the regulation of business in an effort to prevent unfair competition and the evils of monopoly.

Business and industry were subject to periods of depression, some of them very serious. It is not necessary to enter here into a detailed examination of the causes of the fluctuation of the business cycle. The withholding from the workers of adequate wages, with resultant overexpansion in capital outlays, and speculation are among the causes. The "free market," uncontrolled competition, monopoly, concentration of wealth, technological unemployment and depression seem to make a logical sequence. The drive for profits stimulates production. Wages are but reluctantly and inadequately increased. Buying power does not keep pace with production. *An appearance of overproduction is created,* even though it is underconsumption that actually exists. Overexpansion in the hope of more profits makes the situation all the more precarious. The market begins to recede; fear develops; the depression is on. Whatever the causes, these depressions and the dislocation and suffering caused by them cannot be denied nor the fact that their continued recurrence constitutes a threat to democracy. All these factors contributed to the growing intensive struggle for foreign markets between the great industrial nations during the fifty years preceding the World War.

Since the war, industrial nations have been confronted by that social phenomenon known as "technological unemployment." Men and women are deprived of work by new laborsaving machines and by improved processes of mass production so well illustrated by the famous Ford production line. This dislocation of workers by new machinery has characterized the whole history of the Industrial Revolution, but today the unemployed are no longer quickly absorbed in new industries, as formerly.

The improvement of laborsaving devices has been greatly stimulated by the drive for corporate profits, even during the depression. The new machines and processes call for fewer workers and in some instances are all but automatic. Smith Brothers constructed a new plant for the manufacture of automobile chassis at Milwaukee in which some two hundred employees produced more units than were formerly turned out by two thousand workers.[1] The new machines and processes threw many out of work on the farms and in industry, so that even in the prosperous years of the twenties there were no fewer than two million unemployed in the United States. Some authorities place the figure as high as four million. With the failure to shorten hours of labor and to increase wages adequately, production was far outstripping buying power. During the depression years the number of unemployed reached sixteen million in this country.

The Situation in the United States

The pattern of development was the same in all industrial nations, but because of conditions peculiar to this country certain elements in the pattern were accentuated here.

[1] For a description of this factory see Stuart Chase's *The Nemesis of American Business*, Macmillan, 1931.

The United States of 1789 possessed enormous undeveloped resources in land, forests, and minerals. The poor man could find land in the West. The development of the West provided an outlet not only for surplus population of our own country but also for the overcrowded countries of Europe. The West required capital and created a market for the products of the expanding industrial systems of our own and other countries, notably England and Germany.

In no country were the fruits of industry so rich. Vast railway systems were built and industrial empires created in steel, oil, grain, packing, in automobiles, in power, and in the equipment and construction fields. Toward the close of the century great industrial and financial mergers were formed. There was a tremendous concentration of economic power in urban and industrial centers and in the hands of a relatively small number in the population.

By about 1890 the best of the land had been taken up. But too much land had been opened to the plow. For a while, with the advent of the automobile, American industry continued to absorb the workers, but in time the demand for labor began to slacken. Industrialism was spreading throughout the world. Agriculture was being improved everywhere. There were no longer adequate markets at home or abroad for the products of American farms. The depression set in for agriculture following the war, almost a decade before most industries were seriously affected, and still continues despite the new policies of crop control and subsidies.

If prosperity was greatest in the United States, the depressions have been sharp and severe. This was particularly true of the panics that came in 1873 and 1893. The fact that after each depression not only recovery but new heights of prosperity came within a few

years tended to confirm in many the conviction that periods of hard times were a part of the natural order of things and that, just as surely, returning prosperity and progress were also part of the natural order. But the depression following 1929 has been so prolonged and so severe as to raise questions in the minds of many as to whether, after all, either God or nature was the author of all the suffering. With the closing of the frontier we had entered upon a new and uncertain chapter in our history. But most Americans were for forty years unaware of that stupendous fact.

A Highly Interdependent Economy

The economic system of the United States today is very unlike that which Andrew Jackson knew a century ago. The American farm of that time was much more nearly a self-contained economic unit than now. Although men like John Taylor of Caroline, the leading economist of his day in this country and a friend of Jefferson, had already foreseen the development of the modern corporation and the resultant concentration of wealth, the market was still fairly free in Jackson's time, competition was unrestrained, and no single corporation was strong enough to dominate any field of trade. It is true that credit was largely controlled by the United States bank, but that control was soon to be abolished. It is also true that the industrial interests of the North were growing rapidly and were gaining the advantage of a protective tariff. But the era was, in the main, one of free trade.

How different is the picture today. The small corporation that gave John Taylor so much concern has now grown into the giant that he feared. The relatively self-contained economic unit, whether of farm or shop, has all but vanished. The elements of our economic life are

closely interconnected. The United States is now an industrial nation. Only about one-fifth of our people actually live on the farm, as against 90 per cent in 1789. Farming is becoming ever more specialized. Industrial and commercial life is dominated by a chain of vast corporations covering every field of production, processing, distribution, construction, transportation, and financing. The control of these corporations is interlocked in various ways.[1] The prosperity of the farmer is more than ever dependent on the prosperity of industry, and the reverse is also true. At the same time, our economy is so interwoven with a closely integrated world economy that disturbances in distant countries often have most serious and immediate effects on us.

The development of virtual monopolies, by the granting of franchises in transportation, communication, and power transmission, or, more naturally, as the strong corporation by fair methods or foul crowded out the weak, has necessitated regulation by state and national governments. In the last seventy years a great mass of legislation has been enacted for the regulation of business and industry in the public interest, and numerous government agencies such as state public-service or utility commissions, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities Exchange Commission have been created for the administration of these laws. Economic individualism is no longer the reality it once was.

The Change in the Nature of Ownership

In Andrew Jackson's time, ownership meant ownership of or legal claims on tangible property, lands,

[1] See Adolph A. Berle, Jr., and Gardiner C. Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, Macmillan, 1934; also, Ferdinand Lundberg, *America's Sixty Families*, Vanguard Press, 1937.

factories, merchandise, ships. Most businesses were still owned by individuals or by partnerships. The limited-liability corporation was still in its infancy. Today General Motors is "owned" by many thousands of individuals, each of whom possesses certain papers that entitle him to interest as long as the company is solvent or to certain rights to profits if there are any. In many instances no single individual or family owns a large proportion of the stock of a corporation. In 1929, according to Berle and Means, the twenty largest stockholders owned only 4.6 per cent of the outstanding stock of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The managers of this enterprise are not its owners or, at best, hold a fraction of its shares of stock. T. W. Arnold says in his *Folklore of Capitalism*, "It is obvious today that private property has disappeared," adding that although there are still owners of independent private property, they are far down in the social scale, as, for example, farmers with but little cash income. According to Arnold, "Wealth today consists in nothing any one individual can use. The standards of wealth are simply current expectations of how the individual stands with the rulers of industrial baronies coupled with a guess as to the strength of those principalities."[1] Nevertheless, the ownership of corporate shares is not widely distributed among the people. Berle and Means, in *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, estimated that the total number of stockholders in the country in 1929 was between four and seven million persons, and "73.7 of corporate dividends were received by 597,003 persons reporting incomes of $5000 or more." In 1935, of the six million farmers of the country 43 per

[1] T. W. Arnold, *The Folklore of Capitalism*, Yale University Press, 1937. Note particularly pp. 121–127 on the "language of property."

cent were tenants. In 1930, two-fifths of the farms were mortgaged.

The trend is plainly away from the wide distribution of ownership of productive property that was the essence of economic individualism in its early days and toward collective ownership. Collectivism is one of the color words, the use of which is likely to give heart failure to many who are favored by the existing order of things, for the simple reason that to them it signifies nothing short of socialism and the complete abolition of private ownership of property. But there is every reason why the economic phenomena and trends of our time should be accurately described. Collectivism is, of course, not an absolute but a relative matter. It has various manifestations. There is a radical difference between the collectivism developing in the United States, where the instruments of production are still owned by private individuals but increasingly so through corporate shares, and the controls developing in the fascist states or the ownership of all the instruments of production and distribution by the state in Russia.

The pressing problem that confronts us is how to manage this vast, complicated, integrated, corporately controlled economy in the interests of the people without the destruction of all the values of liberalism and democracy. This problem profoundly affects the work of education.

The Nature of the Crisis

We are now in a position to see more clearly the nature of the crisis and how fundamental and far-reaching it is. Viewed from one standpoint, we are confronted simultaneously with three crises, an economic crisis, a political crisis, and a crisis in thought. It is true that these are rather three manifestations of one

great crisis and that every aspect of the culture has been affected by the changes wrought by science and machinery in the critical period of transition through which we are living. But each of the three aspects, the economic, the political, and the intellectual, is clearly defined. Let us see more definitely what is involved in each of these areas.

The Economic Crisis. The economic crisis arises out of a complex of factors inherent in industrialism and in the so-called "private enterprise" system, or historic economic individualism. As we have already seen, it is scarcely correct longer to call our economy a private-enterprise system. It is true that Henry Ford, through his mechanical and organizing genius and with the protection of patent laws, has built, and that his family owns, an industrial empire. But it is unnecessary to say that this is one instance in millions and that it could happen again, if at all, only under similar circumstances at the initial stage of the development of a new machine or industry. What chance has a workman in a Ford factory who has even the greatest intelligence and enterprise but who is without funds to go into the business of manufacturing automobiles? Certainly his chances of becoming president of the United States are much greater. Modern industrialism has profoundly altered the distribution and control of wealth, the class structure of our society, and the opportunities for individual initiative.

Of basic importance is the fact that most workers have been separated from ownership in the tools of production. A vast class of wage earners who have nothing to sell but their labor has come into existence. This class includes not only the industrial workers but the white-collar workers as well and almost the entire professional group. In some instances, as under the civil

service, the tenure of these workers is protected, but this is scarcely true outside the government service. The worker is hired or turned off, just as machines are turned on or off, with the rise or fall of the business curve. Of the 48,829,920 workers in the United States, as shown by the 1930 census, approximately four-fifths belong to this wage-earning class in shop, office, mine, or on the farms. With their hold on employment precarious, the psychology of those dependent on wages or salaries is characterized by a feeling of dependence and of fear. Only a minority of farmers own their property outright, clear of all encumbrances. The rapid growth of mergers and holding companies and of the chain store is familiar to every citizen who reads a daily paper. The number of effective independent entrepreneurs is steadily decreasing.

Profit is the motive force of this economic system. Even in a market that is largely controlled or dominated by virtual corporate monopolies, a fierce struggle is carried on for position or advantage. Competition may be between housing and automobiles. With each industry struggling to enhance profits by cutting costs through improvement of management and of labor-saving machinery, employment becomes steadily more precarious. Economic individualism has been unable to prevent depressions; in fact, as we have seen, left alone, it pursues constantly those policies that can lead only to depressions.

Despite the marvelous productive power of modern technology and the natural resources of our country, more than half of our people are without any form of economic security. The economic equality that once formed the base of social and political democracy in this country has been largely destroyed. Unless our economy can be so managed that it will restore economic well-being and security to all who are willing to work, vast

numbers face a condition that will be little better than slavery. This is the economic crisis that confronts us today and that underlies the political and intellectual crises.

The Political Crisis. The political crisis grows out of the economic crisis. When economic security was within reach of virtually every family, when there was actually a very wide distribution of the ownership of productive property, when four-fifths of the families still lived on the land and industry was still carried on largely in small shops, when there was no economic power strong enough to challenge or thwart the will of the people, democracy flourished. Today, with the majority of the people entirely dependent on wages for existence, totally lacking economic security, without economic power except as it is wielded by organized labor, organized farmers, and political pressure and control by government, democracy is in imminent danger. The right to vote is likely to appear of little consequence to the man who is unable to find work to support his family. He may soon be willing to barter his ballot for a promise of security no matter how meager or spurious the security promised. Vast wealth has been created in this country in the past seventy-five years, but the majority of the people have no property except the clothes on their backs and the meager furniture in their homes. Business and industry, on the contrary, have exerted a tremendous influence on government, so much so as to give some color to the dictum of Karl Marx that in a capitalist society government is but the executive committee of the capitalist class.

The history of American politics since the first administration of Jefferson has been the history of a struggle by the people to control economic processes in their own interests. This was the true significance of

Jefferson's struggle with the Federalists and of Jackson's war on the bank. This was the meaning of the agrarian revolt in the West following the Civil War. This was the meaning of the greenback movement in the seventies, of the populist movement in the eighties and nineties. This is the meaning of the more recent progressive movements in both parties led by such men as Bryan, the La Follettes, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Norris, Borah, and Franklin Roosevelt. This leadership has always aimed at reform rather than fundamental reconstruction, at regulation rather than government ownership of utilities, heavy industries, and credit. These movements have often been confused, have thrown up many erratic leaders such as Senator Borah and demagogues such as Huey Long. But the owners of corporate wealth have never been confused as to their immediate interests, though many have seemed hopelessly ignorant of the great economic trends of the age and of their own long-range interests. It seems to me that no other interpretation can be put on the implacable hatred of the majority of this class for the works of Franklin Roosevelt.

When the current depression deepened, agitators of the type of Long and Father Coughlin appeared, appealing to and promising everything to the dispossessed, a most ominous sign, for the appeal of these men smacked of fascism in method if not in purpose. For fascism has represented the seizure of power by an oligarchy that rises to power on the backs of the hard-pressed middle and working classes. Its appeal is to the dispossessed and depressed members of the middle class and to the unemployed. Once in power, the party and military dictatorship that fascism is vastly increases the control of the economy by the central government, an interesting

and significant phenomenon, which, in the opinion of some, leads inevitably in the direction of state socialism.

The struggle of the people to control their economic life has reached a critical stage in the modern world. The system of tariffs and quotas, the struggle for self-sufficiency on the part of nations lacking natural resources in their attempts to solve their economic problems, often for military or other means of defense and conquest, has virtually strangled international trade. In this situation is found the explanation of the authoritarian regimes that have been established not only in Italy and Germany but in most of the countries of Europe.

Unless we can solve the problem of economic security for the common man, we can have no hope for the continuation of democracy in the United States. This is the political crisis that confronts us.

The Crisis in Thought. Associated with the economic and political crises is an intellectual crisis, a conflict between two world outlooks or philosophies.

One of these world outlooks is authoritarian, the other, scientific and experimental, or pragmatic, and democratic. According to the first, institutions, laws, values are to be judged by their conformance to universals that have the authority of absolutes. The discovery of truth, or knowing, is a process of discovering the universals or absolutes that constitute the patterns of which the mundane world is so poor an expression. Where this outlook prevails, law and moral values are imposed by authority. This world view derives from the philosophic idealism or absolutisms of Plato, Aristotle, and St. Thomas Aquinas. Fascism is a perversion of this outlook, but it is also a reversion to it. Inevitably, this view exalts established institutions, especially the authority

of the state. Under fascism the state is everything; the individual is only an instrument of the state.

According to the democratic, experimental, and scientific view, institutions and laws are to be judged by the extent to which they serve human needs, by their operational effects. The individual is the end, not the instrument of government. Authority is resident in the people. The authors of our Declaration of Independence were, in fact, giving expression to this view when they said:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights Governments are constituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

If the absolutist philosophy prevails, all values and laws of conduct will be imposed in economics, in politics, in social relationships, in morals and religion. The peoples of the Western world *should* know this system that, carried to its logical conclusion, reduces the ordinary individual to an automaton, for the Western world has been struggling for centuries to free itself from this system. If the democratic philosophy prevails, policies will be developed in all areas of life in the light of experience and of human needs, for this view emphasizes the worth and dignity of human personality. It is the way of science and of democracy.

The conflict between these two intellectual systems is an irreconcilable one. There is every reason to believe

that this conflict will continue until the authoritarian system has been completely overthrown or is completely victorious, through brute force, for it is inconceivable that man will not continue to love and to seek liberty, freedom, and security, or will easily surrender these values of civilization. It is conceivable that a victory for fascism might plunge the world into another dark age. Let us not be deceived as to the issues at stake in the conflict between authoritarianism and democracy. This is the intellectual crisis that grips the contemporary world.

The Crisis in American Democracy

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw the establishment of political democracy. Nowhere were social and political democracy more fully realized than in the United States. In the twentieth century the struggle for democracy is being waged fiercely on the economic front. Unless democracy can restore economic security to the people, unless productive processes can be made to serve the interests of all, democracy is done for. The struggle is no longer primarily for political rights for the individual but for economic security. Wherever the forces of reaction and of economic privilege are victorious, the political rights of the individual are destroyed.

It would be misleading to suggest that the issues are always clear, that the individual is always conscious of whether he is working for the common good or against it, or that the actual purposes and tendencies of the various organized groups or of the various social classes or interests are always clear to the individuals that compose them. But the array of forces for and against the democratic ideal is, nevertheless, perfectly clear. Arrayed against democracy today are all those forces striving to maintain the economic *status quo*. It is essen-

tially a relatively small group in our society that owns or controls most of the productive, industrial, and business wealth of the country, that opposes needed economic changes. The middle class is confused and divided in its sympathies, but the *status quo* is defended by many members of this class who still have faith in their own future under the existing economy and each of whom hopes some day to become a capitalist. The defenders of democracy are, on the other hand, largely drawn from this same middle class and from the ranks of wage earners.

As we have said, individuals are often unaware of the parts they play. Many persons of wealth are devoted to philanthropy and social betterment, and many are intelligent about economic problems and prepared to make sacrifices for the common good. But in general this group resists social and economic changes. Lundberg has shown in his study of sixty American families the immense economic power wielded by this tiny group of persons. Of even greater significance is the study of the power and influence of one family in one community, the "X" family described in *Middletown in Transition* by Robert and Helen Lynd.[1] The Lynds show how the influence and interests of a family of great wealth permeate and largely shape every activity, industrial, business, educational, religious, social, of a community.

That there is a class structure in American society is a fact that cannot be questioned. According to Hacker in *The United States—A Graphic History*, there were reported in 1929 about 631,000 family incomes of more than $10,000 in the United States. Allowing one income to a family, this number represented roughly 2.3 per cent of American families. It is true that many of the

[1] Robert S. and Helen Merrill Lynd, *Middletown in Transition*, Harcourt Brace, 1937.

earlier advocates of democracy, like Jefferson, Paine, and Mann, looked forward to a society without classes, at least without classes in the European sense, but American society has always had its class lines. After the Revolution, when land was still abundant and economic opportunities were plentiful, class lines were less evident, at least outside the South, than ever before in a culture so advanced. The social equality that characterized American society of a hundred years ago greatly impressed such discerning European students and observers as Tocqueville and Beaumont. But with the development of the closely integrated economy of today, with the increasing concentration of wealth in a relatively few hands, class lines are again growing sharper. Stratification is, of course, almost entirely along economic lines. The psychology of the American people is still overwhelmingly democratic and equalitarian in outlook and sympathy, and Americans generally are not conscious of class. Defined in terms of freehold farmers or independent small entrepreneurs, the historic middle class which has been the very backbone of American democracy seems to be declining in numbers. However, if professional and white-collar workers are considered as constituting a genuine middle class regardless of ownership of productive property, then this class still has great vitality. But, again, its psychology is increasingly one of doubt and fear. It lacks the confidence of earlier times. Then, too, there must be set over against this group the one-third of the nation that, in the words of the President, are "ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed," and as this is written, no less than eight million workers are still unemployed. *The New York Times* for Sunday, Apr. 2, 1939, reported a survey of conditions in urban communities by the Institute of Public Opinion which showed:

1. That one person in every five among those interviewed would [if unemployed] have to look to the government for relief within a month's time or even sooner. This would mean, for example, a doubling of the country's present relief load by May, if all such persons lost their jobs today.

2. That another large group could hold out for some period between a month and six months.

3. That these two groups, plus those now on relief, amount to 52 per cent of the country's working population in cities and towns.

The continuance of such a state of affairs is a menace to every democratic ideal.[1]

The problem of the twentieth century is, then, the problem of the control of the economy in the interests of all the people. It is a continuation of the old struggle of the people against economic privilege. In this struggle political democracy is a powerful weapon. But political democracy has been overthrown in most of the countries of Europe. There is every reason to believe that democracy is coming rapidly to its supreme test in this country, as in every other country in which it still exists.[2]

The outcome will to a considerable extent be determined by the kind of education that is afforded Americans, young and old. Although the schools cannot build a new social order, the contribution of education is vital. But before we enquire what a program of education for democracy today would be, it is essential to consider what is possible and what desirable in American life in the future and to examine the problem of ends and means.

[1] For important discussions of the problems and status of social classes in the United States today the reader is referred to Lewis Corey, *The Crisis of the Middle Class*, Covici-Friede, 1935; Alfred M. Bingham, *Insurgent America*, Harper, 1935.

[2] For a most realistic and illuminating analysis of our assets and liabilities in our fight for the preservation of democracy see George S. Counts, *Prospects of American Democracy*, John Day, 1938.

III

THE PROMISE OF AMERICAN LIFE

THE United States is favored in the struggle to preserve democracy and to realize its potentialities. As yet, authoritarianism has prevailed only in those countries without natural or technical resources adequate to their needs and with cultural and political backgrounds different from those of the more democratic countries. These are facts of supreme importance in the crisis that confronts this generation. So far as resources are concerned, fascism need not happen here. But if Americans are to employ their resources wisely, they must know what they are.

Cultural and Human Resources

Americans of today are the heirs of the culture of the entire Western world. It is true that in the migration to and settlement in a new country thousands of miles away, and particularly in the extension of the settlements across the Alleghenies and into the West, much was forgotten, and there was a genuine loss of culture. However, some of that which was forgotten or consciously left behind or that proved unadaptable to the new conditions was better lost. Similarly, much of value that was lost was later recovered and enriched in the new world.

English customs and political institutions were transplanted to American soil, for the first settlers of what is

now the United States were predominantly English. Americans are, then, the heirs of the long struggle of the English for political liberty. They are the heirs of Magna Carta, of the parliamentary system, of all those institutions of jurisprudence and of local self-government that had been developing on English soil for more than a thousand years. Under American conditions the pattern of development was, of course, different in important respects from the later development in the mother country. In many respects conditions here were more favorable to the growth of democratic institutions. The feudal system with its social castes never really took root in American soil.

Many of the early colonists came seeking freedom from religious or political oppression or escape from the hard economic conditions of the middle and lower classes in the Europe of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Puritans were, of course, intolerant and autocratic enough in their own theocracy, but they were, at the same time, religious and political dissenters. It is significant that Roger Williams and others were advocates of complete religious tolerance and also of genuine social equality and political democracy. The early colonists included the Quakers, advocates of peace and toleration, the Catholics, who sought a refuge in Maryland and established almost complete religious toleration there, the Lutherans, Mennonites, Huguenots, and others who came to escape religious or political persecution in continental countries. These latter brought with them much of French and German culture. In time French Louisiana and Spanish Florida were included within our boundaries. Although the English, Dutch, Germans, French, and Scandinavians made up more than nine-tenths of the population of the original colonies, other European countries were represented.

The frontier was a school for democracy. Only recently have we begun to understand, through the researches and interpretations of Frederick J. Turner and others, the extent to which the frontier moulded American life and institutions. The frontier has been called a mighty leveler. It tested the courage and perseverance of men and valued the individual for what he was and what he could do rather than for the prestige of his family. The frontier demanded and fostered industry, initiative, independence of judgment and action. It also required cooperation. Log rollings, corn huskings, barn raisings, and quilting bees, as well as loneliness and isolation, characterized frontier life. The neighbors had to unite for the performance of many essential tasks. "Swapping" work was a necessity. Defense compelled unity and concerted action on many occasions.

A great mythology has grown up about the frontier. According to this mythology, the frontier fostered "rugged individualism," and because of that fact "rugged individualism" is one of our sacred virtues. The truth is that the frontiersman was a realist because he lived in a world of hard necessities as well as one of boundless opportunities. He applied the pragmatic test to laws and institutions. If they served individual needs and the interests of the community, they were good; if not, he believed it was his right to "alter, or abolish" them, and he said as much in his Declaration of Independence in 1776. The frontier tended to develop men who were unafraid to express their convictions and to act on them. It had precious little respect for mere respectability. A fact that is too commonly overlooked is that the frontier was a school for cooperation for the common good which is a fundamental principle of democracy. And this trait is today deeply ingrained in the American people and is one of their greatest assets.

The frontier nourished that naturalness and directness in social contact, that informality and genuine social democracy which is today characteristic of the American people at their best. Friendliness, helpfulness, resourcefulness counted for much. Largely as a result of frontier influences, class distinctions are less marked today in America than in older countries. Most men of wealth sincerely pride themselves on being democratic, and it is beyond question true that Americans, almost without exception, do believe in democracy, though they would by no means always agree as to its meaning and implications today. There is a strong feeling in this country that one man is "as good as another, if not a little better," as the saying goes. Americans have never experienced to any great extent those feelings of deference that are characteristic of the less privileged classes in more sharply stratified societies. This, too, is a priceless element in our heritage and one we are in danger of losing.

The American People Today

During the nineteenth century approximately thirty-four million immigrants landed on our shores. In the early decades of the century the British Isles continued to supply most of these immigrants. In the forties and fifties there was a great migration of the Irish, who brought with them capacity for hard work, their characteristic Irish humor and optimism, and a spirit of independence that had been nurtured in the long struggle against English rule. After 1848 conditions in Germany resulted in an extensive migration of Germans, including many of those who had fought for freedom in the revolution of that year, choice spirits such as Carl Schurz. These exiles brought the best of German culture. Immediately preceding and following the Civil War there was a

large migration of Scandinavians, especially to Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other states of the Northwest—a sturdy stock, lovers of freedom, coming from countries advanced in democracy and richly endowed culturally. In this period Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles began to settle not only in the industrial regions but in the plains states, bringing with them memories of an age-old struggle for freedom. Willa Cather's *My Antonia* portrays vividly some of the spiritual values that the Bohemians, for example, brought to American life.

Until this time migration to America had been largely from the Northern European countries, but toward the close of the century immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe—Italy, Hungary, Poland, Russia, and the Balkan states—began and rose to its high tide in the first two decades of the new century. However, with the closing of the frontier and the steady advance of technology, the demand for labor began to slacken, to be renewed feverishly during the war years. Because of the severe restrictions placed on immigration after the war, the numbers coming to our shores have since been negligible. But American life had been enriched by those who had come from Southern and Western Europe. America has indeed been a melting pot. The process has been in many ways painful, but who can doubt that in this crucible a great race and culture are being fused?

Included in our population are many from other races and cultures, of which the Negroes are the largest group. The presence of the Negro has created a complex social problem, but has, at the same time, added much to the richness of American life. The culture of the aborigines, the American Indians, has also left its impress on the people, added much that is positive, much that is interesting and colorful. Included, too, are representatives of almost all the ancient cultures of the East. In a

peculiar sense we are, then, the cultural heirs of the whole world.

The United States is now approaching the time when its population will cease to grow. For many decades the birth rate has been falling, and the rate of population increase has declined despite the reduction in the death rate that modern medicine and sanitation have brought about. Supporting their statements with comprehensive data, students of the problem tell us that the population of the country will be stabilized at possibly 170,000,000 long before the close of the century, probably by 1960 or 1970. After that there may be an actual decline.

The economic and social effects of the stabilization of population are bound to be far-reaching, though, of course, it is impossible to foresee them except in broadest outline. Relative to the total population, there will be fewer children and youth to educate. Already the decline in enrollment has begun in the elementary school. The problem of providing social security for the older adults may become more, or less, difficult. Will a population so predominantly adult be more, or less, inclined toward social experimentation? Of one thing we may be sure. The resources for the support of our people are more than abundant, for this country could, with efficient use of technical processes in agriculture and industry, support a population three times as large as the present population.

Natural Resources

Those who settled in what is now the United States came into possession of the richest domain on the face of the earth. The greater part of our country lies in that thermal zone which the geographers say has proved the most stimulating and favorable natural environment for man. This country, with the exception of the great plains and the arid regions of the West, was once clothed with

the most magnificent and valuable forest ever known. The fertility of the soil, both in the cleared forest and in the vast prairie region, was not exceeded anywhere. Even after a century of ruthless waste and terrific soil erosion, the Mississippi Valley is, beyond question, still the most productive agricultural region in the world. This new country offered to the settlers mighty mountains and rivers, magnificent and varied scenery, and a climate ranging from the semitropical to the north temperate. The waters of thousands of miles of coast line and of the great inland fresh-water seas and the rivers abounded in fish of almost innumerable variety. No country was richer in large and small game. Beneath our soil is found in abundance nearly all the minerals essential to modern industrial processes, and the deficiencies can nearly all be supplied from American sources. Despite the ignorant and too often greedy and selfish waste of more than three centuries, most of this heritage still remains or is recoverable if prompt and decisive action is taken in the next generation. The growing interest in the need to conserve our soil, forests, minerals, and wild life through reforestation and other measures is one of the most hopeful signs in American life in our time. Of all the countries in the world the United States is the most nearly economically self-contained. Only Russia approaches us in the richness and variety of its natural endowment and in the possibility of a self-contained economy.

Technology

Only England and Germany equal the United States in the realm of applied science and efficiency of technological processes. If Germany leads in chemical industries and England in textiles and shipbuilding, the United States leads in the techniques of mass production, so well

illustrated in the automobile industry. The great industries of the country today maintain extensive research laboratories. No country is so highly mechanized. For example, there were in 1936 twenty-eight million automobiles in use in this country, or 80 per cent of all the automobiles in the world, and eighteen and a half million telephone installations, or 60 per cent of all the telephones in the world.

The United States already has an industrial plant capable of supplying its people with the commodities needed for a much higher standard of living than even this country has known. The possibilities of expanding this plant seem almost unlimited. In this age of electric power the invention of new laborsaving machines and processes goes on at a rapid pace, even in the years of depression. The people are mechanically minded and highly skilled in the operation of machinery. The importance of this as a national asset is apparent if we note the efforts of the Russians to acquire these same skills.

The national income was about ninety billion dollars in 1929. The Brookings Institution study, *America's Capacity to Produce*, found that twenty-nine branches of manufactures, "including industries with very low operating ratios as well as several showing high utilization," produced to only 81 per cent of their capacity that most prosperous year. If our industrial plant had been operated at full capacity, the national income would, according to this study, have been increased by fifteen billion dollars, an increase that would have enabled us to add goods and services to an amount of $765, on the 1929 level, to the consumer gratification of every family having an income of $2,500 or less that year. According to the study made in 1935 by Harold Loeb and others, reported in *The Chart of Plenty*, American farms and industries operated at full capacity in 1929 could have

produced a national income of forty-two billion dollars more than was produced, "sufficient to remove destitution and the fear of destitution from every citizen, without taking away from the fortunate 8 per cent possessing in 1929 incomes of $5,000 or more per family. In fact these fortunate few could have enjoyed more comfort than they did enjoy, as well as a sense of security which at present is non-existent."[1] The technocrats asserted that if the most efficient use were made of our scientific and technical knowledge and skill, an income equivalent to $15,000 or more annually could be made available to every American family. If such estimates enter the realm of the fantastic, the figures of the Brookings Institution and of the *Chart of Plenty* are just as surely conservative.

So far as natural resources and technology are concerned, an "economy of abundance" that would provide economic security for all is, then, a possibility in the United States. This is not to say that it is easy to achieve. The problems that have to be solved to attain this goal are problems of the greatest magnitude and complexity. But these are no longer so much technological problems as moral, social, economic, and political problems.

Political and Educational Resources

Does the United States have the political and intellectual resources to surmount the economic, political, and moral barriers to the realization of these potentialities, without surrender to a dictatorship? It is possible, of course, that an American version of dictatorship might, for a period of time, increase the economic efficiency of the country. Indeed, that is one of the gravest dangers in the present situation. Democratic institutions have been in many ways inefficient here, as

[1] Harold Loeb and associates, *The Chart of Plenty*, Viking Press, 1935.

in other countries. It remains to be seen whether democracy can solve the problem of the intelligent formulation and the prompt and efficient execution of policies essential to the solution of the economic problems of an industrial society.

That our democratic traditions and democratic institutions still have great vitality cannot be questioned. This statement is true for local government, where the spirit of invention has not died out, as indicated by the development of the commission and city-manager forms of municipal government. The successful fight of the Fusion forces for honest government in New York City under Mayor La Guardia, as evidenced by the adoption of a new charter and his reelection in 1937, is encouraging. The record of social legislation in many states, notably in Wisconsin, is also most significant. Under the leadership of Senator Norris, Nebraska has adopted a unicameral legislature, thus breaking a tradition many had thought sacred. The people in both states and nation have done much to curb the evils of unrestrained individualism. Much imagination and ingenuity were displayed by the Roosevelt administration in dealing with the great depression, though no consistent policy based on economic and political realities and possibilities has as yet been constructed. In these latter years it has been demonstrated that even the Supreme Court can be made sensitive to the needs of the people and the social trends of the times.

The people have shown capacity for the development of voluntary organizations for coping with economic problems and for the accomplishment of democratic political purposes. Though unfortunately divided at this time, organized labor has clearly demonstrated that it can be a constructive force in our economic and social life. Likewise, the farmers are learning the lessons

of economic organization. The cooperative movement is growing both in the cities and among the farmers. Although the socialist parties have always been numerically weak, they have nevertheless exerted much influence. Each of the major parties now has a powerful and determined progressive wing, operating wholly within the American democratic tradition.

Of equal importance are the agencies of communication and education. First-hand experience with European papers as well as with our own can leave no doubt that America has the best newspapers in the world, even if it does have, at the same time, some of the worst. We have our staunch defenders of civil liberties, and, despite many lamentable instances of denial, as in Jersey City in recent years, there is still freedom of speech and assembly in the United States. We still have serious problems of racial prejudice and discrimination, but we have nothing approaching the anti-Semitism of fascist countries.

Perhaps the most unique of American institutions is our system of public popular education with the "one educational ladder" extending from the kindergarten to the university. Today the realities and critical problems of our political and economic life are beginning to be studied by youth in these schools and by adults in the public forums now being conducted in many communities as a part of this educational system. It is doubtful whether in any other democratic country more thought is being given to the role of education in the preservation and realization of democracy.

In the defense of democracy, then, we have resources that were lacking in Germany and Italy or in Russia. In no country is the democratic ideal so deeply ingrained. In no country has there been less of class division. In no country is there greater freedom of speech or of press.

No country with a long experience with democracy has as yet gone fascist. Our democratic institutions and democratic traditions still have great vitality. We have shown in the last decade that we are still capable of political and economic invention. We have developed the most extensive and comprehensive free school system. We still have vast natural resources, and our technology is in many ways the most advanced of any country.

Conflicting American Traditions

American traditions constitute one of the most stubborn and potent realities of the contemporary scene. In many instances these traditions are in conflict one with another. The tradition of economic individualism, for example, is at many points in conflict with the tradition of democratic cooperation. These traditions include a spirit of lawlessness, of ruthless exploitation and greed, of interference with civil rights whenever it pleases certain groups so to interfere. These traditions include an inordinate worship of material success, of all things big, especially of the big and successful industrialist. But American traditions also include all the traits and habits of political and social democracy to which we have already referred. Touch the typical American on one side and you find a conservative, but touch him on the other side and you will in all probability find a radical. He may be so inconsistent as to believe, at one and the same time, that our natural resources should be protected and controlled even where the ownership is private, even perhaps that the government should own everything beneath the surface of the earth and yet that it should not in any way interfere in business. It is evident that not all American traditions are resources; some are liabilities. But the habits of intellectual and of political

independence and of social cooperation are strong within us.

Beset as they are by difficult economic and political problems, the people of the United States still hold within their possession the potentialities of the good life, everything essential for the fulfillment of the American dream of freedom, security, and happiness. The question is, how will these potentialities be employed in the future? That is a problem in politics and education that brings us to a consideration of ends and means.

IV

MEANS AND ENDS

Two basic problems confront the contemporary world—the problems of liberty and equality, or of liberty and of economic security for the individual. That equality is the foundation of liberty is an inescapable conclusion from social history. When men are not economically secure, they cannot be politically and socially free. So long as millions of Americans are unable to find employment, so long as 42 per cent of the families with incomes of less than $1,500 receive only 13 per cent of the national income, whereas at the other end of the social scale less than one-fourth of 1 per cent of the families receive 14.8 per cent of the national income, our democratic institutions are in grave danger. This is a problem for education, for the people must understand the causes of conditions if they are to deal with them effectively. We must, then, reexamine the problem of liberty.

It is true that all government means a curtailment of individual liberty, though it is equally true that restriction on the liberties of some members of society has always meant an increase of liberty for others. When the robber barons of the Middle Ages were restrained, this restraint meant security and thus more liberty for the traveler and trader. When the political and economic revolutions of the latter part of the eighteenth century curbed the liberties, that is, the power, of king and

fedual lord, that repression meant an increase of liberty for merchants and manufacturers. The overthrow of these old regimes likewise meant an increase of political and therefore of economic power, that is, of liberty, for the common man. It is significant that it was necessary to appeal to the rights of the common man to achieve this revolution. To come nearer home, it is a curtailment of a man's liberty to prevent him from building a soap factory on the public square, but it is also a protection of the liberties of others. Liberty is a relative thing, and so is equality. To talk about a "sphere of liberty" as though a realm of absolute liberty exists, or of a "sphere of law," as though law is not an essential of liberty, is but to confuse issues. Equality and liberty are dependent one upon the other.[1]

When there was a wide distribution of productive property in the United States, as in the Jacksonian period, equality and genuine individual liberty were more widespread than they have been since that time. The advent of the Industrial Revolution and the factory system brought into existence a large class of industrial wage earners who own no productive property, have little control over their own jobs, nothing to sell but their labor. To the man who owns no property, who is entirely dependent on daily wages for his daily bread, and who can find no work to support himself and his family, political equality may mean but little. It must have been primarily of this man that T. V. Smith was thinking when he wrote:

> As the voter walks into the polling booth and sweats over a hundred names hardly less familiar to him than the duties of the offices they seek, he mutters to himself: "Is this liberty?

[1] For a penetrating discussion of this problem and for a somewhat different interpretation of the issues involved the reader is referred to *Liberty and Equality* by William F. Russell, Macmillan, 1936.

Is this equality? Is this fraternity?" Yes; equality for an hour, liberty to gesticulate with a pencil in the dark, fraternity with those who share his plight.[1]

The establishment of political equality of the principles of government by consent, of manhood suffrage, of one man, one vote, was one of man's greatest achievements. Political equality is endangered today because so many men find themselves without economic security and economic power.

Proposals for Security

The struggle that is being waged in the modern world is, above all, a struggle for the control of economic power both between nations and within nations. It is out of this struggle that the political and intellectual crises arise. The principal defenders of things as they are are naturally those groups in society to whom the existing conditions afford a comfortable status and hope of continued security. The authoritarian may be a last-ditch defender of the *status quo* or a proponent of radical change.

There is a general recognition on the part of all parties that the security of any political regime depends on a modicum of economic security and welfare for the masses. Various proposals are advanced for bringing about a functioning of our economy efficient enough to ensure political stability. These may be classified for our purposes, and, I think logically, into five categories. It is essential for educators to understand them.

1. The first is called capitalism under the delusion that the present economic system approximates in principles and practice the economy described by Adam Smith a century and a half ago. This system assumes a

[1] Thomas Vernor Smith, *The Democratic Way of Life*, University of Chicago Press, 1926.

free market and free competition. It also assumes private ownership of the instruments of production and distribution and profit as the motivating forces in the economy, both of which do obtain at the present time, although the nature of ownership has been profoundly modified by corporate forms. The element of competition has been greatly reduced in most sectors by the growth of giant commercial and industrial enterprises under the modern corporation. This situation has resulted in government regulation. But powerful economic interests have been able to influence government, and often to control it so as to defeat the public interest, to prevent essential regulation, and actually to gain favors. In fact, then, the uncompromising advocates of "capitalism" are not simply defending the economic *status quo* with all its brutal injustices and inefficiency, its inability to provide work or to produce to capacity. They would turn the clock back by freeing business from most of existing regulation. As James Madison pointed out long ago, party is always based on economic interest, and today it is primarily those who benefit by the existing system who are fighting to prevent further changes in it. The ideologists and apologists for this reactionary economic and political philosophy hold that the state should exercise only police power, should not dislocate the economy by attempts to regulate it.

2. Many persons, however, who believe in private ownership and profit also recognize the inexorable trend toward a controlled economy. They would retain private ownership and profit but would modify both these principles by instituting more extensive regulation and rationalization through planning and by increasing the part played by government in the economy. This school of thought shades off in one direction toward historic capitalism and in the other toward socialism. The more liberal wing

of this party favors some collective ownership, especially in the field of municipal utilities, of power and even of railroads and other "sick" industries. Advocates of this reformed and transformed capitalism would protect labor in its right to organize and bargain collectively. They likewise favor an adequate program of social security. The New Deal looks in this direction. This is roughly the point of view of the progressive wings of both the old parties today, though some of these progressives (more exactly, insurgents) have looked backward in the fond but unrealistic hope that through antitrust legislation monopolies can be broken up and competition and the wide distribution of ownership characteristic of an earlier period of our history restored. This progressive school of thought is really carrying on the tradition of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson, whose concern was that government should protect and promote the interests of the common man and to that end, that government should not be controlled by vested financial interests. According to this view, what is needed now is reform, regulation, planning, government investment in housing and public works, the extension of social services, and some experimentation with collective ownership of essential public services on the "yardstick" principle.

The proponents of this view also strongly favor the development of producers' and consumers' cooperatives. Indeed, it is the view of many that the development of cooperatives on a wide scale in all sectors of the economy offers the most practical solution of our economic and social problems. In a very real sense this movement, which looks in the direction of a cooperative commonwealth, may be regarded as a distinctive proposal for economic reconstruction.

3. The third school, the socialist, holds that production should be for use and not for profit and advocates

as the only permanent solution of our difficulties collective ownership of all the principal instruments of production and distribution. The socialists would thus break the grip of the relatively small group that owns the great industries of our economy. In this way they would restore ownership, and thus control, to the people, for they contend that control of these functions can be exercised only through collective ownership. Reform of economic individualism, or capitalism, is, therefore, no solution. As the reader knows, there are important differences of view among socialists. For example, the guild socialists and syndicalists, fearing concentration of power in a central bureaucracy under state socialism, advocate the ownership and control of the various industries or services by the workers in them, with central planning and coordinating agencies.

The socialists, or social democrats, accept in the main the Marxist interpretation of history and his class analysis of contemporary society. The socialists have preached the international solidarity and cooperation of the workers and have opposed economic nationalism and imperialism in all their forms. They are opposed to all "capitalist" wars. They believe in democracy and would rely on the institutions of political democracy, supplemented by the development of collective forms such as cooperatives, for the gradual achievement of socialism. Trade-unionism would constitute the backbone of this movement. They abhor violent revolution but recognize the possibility of resistance by reactionary forces in society when the socialists, having come into control of the government through orderly democratic processes, undertake to introduce socialism. They hold that the power of the state, including the military and police powers, should then be employed to maintain order and carry out the mandate of the people expressed through

the ballot. The social democratic parties achieved much influence in Western European countries prior to the war, and it was this party that organized the German republic.

4. To the left of the socialists are the communists, who would establish socialism as the first step toward a communistic society in which the state, which they regard merely as the instrument of power of the capitalistic class, would wither away. The communists profess democracy as their goal but hold that the dictatorship of the proletariat is essential to the establishment of democracy. They point to history for support for their contention that no ruling class has ever given up its power without a struggle. According to Marxist theory, the key to understanding of economic and, therefore, of political and cultural history is to be found in the "relations of production," the sum total of which always constitutes the "economic structure of society." The relations of production are "the real foundations, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness." The interests of the two classes in capitalistic society, the owners and the workers, the exploited and the exploiters, are opposed and can never be reconciled. This opposition can only be resolved through socialism and then communism, which will profoundly modify all political and social institutions.

After the Russian Revolution, the Communist party broke away from the Second International and formed the Third or Communist International, the secretariat of which, located at Moscow, is known as the Comintern. There have been important changes in the communistic "line" since that time. A principal tenet of communist theory originally was that the overthrow of the capitalist class and the establishment of a socialist society in

every country, that is, "world revolution," was essential to the security of a socialist or communist regime in any country. But with the ascendancy of Stalin the Russian Communist party was committed to the doctrine of building socialism in one country.

The communists would employ the institutions of liberalism and democracy, civil liberties and the ballot to further their purposes in the capitalistic countries, but the party has held consistently that the transition to socialism can come only through a revolutionary situation. Recent changes in the policy of the Comintern have been in the direction of emphasizing the importance of maintaining democratic institutions, the so-called "popular front" policy, in the struggle against fascism. There is every reason to believe that the communist parties in all countries are controlled primarily by the exigencies of Russian foreign policy.

5. The antithesis of democracy and of socialism is fascism. It is very important to understand the nature and program of fascism. Fascism, under whatever form or name it appears, seems to begin with an acceptance of private ownership of the instruments of production and the profit system, but it utterly rejects democracy and sets up in its stead the authoritarian or totalitarian state, in which all authority is wielded by an oligarchy exercising power through a military dictatorship. Fascism introduces an enormous measure of control and regimentation—which, in the opinion of many, is bound to lead to fundamental changes in the economy and ultimately to some form of socialism. The capitalist classes in Germany and Italy accepted fascism reluctantly, believing in their ignorance and fear the propaganda that fascism was the only alternative to communism that was available to them. Fascism has always arisen out of the struggle of the hard-pressed

middle classes to rehabilitate themselves and is taken up by many of the "big bourgeoisie" as a last resort under the illusion that its only choice is between fascism and communism. The theory of fascism has arisen in the form of rationalizations of *faits accomplis* and has not as yet been fully developed. Fascism is a product of all the social forces and failures of the nineteenth century, of the accentuation in the countries in which it has arisen of the economic crisis described in the second chapter. It employs for social control the institutions developed by democracy, such as the schools, and in its plebiscites even claims to be democratic. Mussolini's corporate state providing for a central legislative body based on functional groups smacks of democracy. But fascism is thoroughly undemocratic, the last refuge of authoritarianism and reaction. Under this system the state is exalted; the individual is merely the instrument of the state.

In a very true sense we have now completed the circle in the examination of these proposals, for there is a close affinity between the fascists and the reactionary advocates of *laissez faire* who, when their privileges are threatened, do not hesitate to employ the power of the state to achieve their purposes. Indeed, the reactionaries fear the extension of democracy and, above all else, socialism. But they have never resisted government interference in business when business and industry benefited.

The Problem of Method

It is apparent that the crisis confronting the Western world involves disagreements concerning methods of effecting economic and social changes quite as fundamental as disagreements concerning objectives. It is

generally recognized that the economic impasse has to be resolved. But how?

It will be observed that three of the proposals for security that have just been described are put forward by parties that accept the democratic method—the capitalist, the reform-capitalist or progressive, and the socialist.[1] The United States is a capitalist democracy; but we must always bear in mind that pure capitalism does not exist anywhere, that in the United States many socialistic enterprises are carried on, such as the post office, the public-school system, the highways, and municipally owned utilities. In the United States both the Republican and Democratic parties, the Socialist party, and the parties in between accept the democratic method. And, in my opinion, it is an incontrovertible reality, however much it may be denied by the extreme Marxian parties, that the capitalist parties can and do believe in political democracy. Fascism employs the methods of authority and force and rejects liberalism completely. It rejects freedom of speech, assembly, and press, and all parliamentary institutions, though, as we have seen, it may on occasion pay a certain lip service to popular sovereignty.[2] The Communist party and certain other extreme left-wing sects, always at war with one

[1] Nominally there is no capitalist party in any of the democratic countries, but actually there are capitalist parties. Both the Republican and Democratic parties in the United States are capitalist parties, and there is little difference between them, for each has its conservative and progressive wings. The progressive parties are reform-capitalist. The conservative party of Great Britain is a capitalist party. The social democratic parties in Germany and Austria were "Fabian" socialist. The Labor party in Great Britain is a Fabian socialist party.

[2] The reader is referred to a chapter by Hans Kohn in *Dictatorship in the Modern World*, edited by Guy Stanton Ford, University of Minnesota Press, 1935, for an illuminating analysis of fascist dictatorship and the respects in which it differs from historic autocracies and dictatorships and the ways in which it is related to the democratic movement of the last century.

another, want the protection of civil liberties but hold that the historic situation will develop to a point where revolution is inevitable. At that point a disciplined party that has been gradually fashioned and tested through the "class struggle" will establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the meantime, this party itself is conducted on principles that are not democratic. Theoretically, discussion within the party may continue freely until the party line is established by vote, after which there must be absolute acceptance of and obedience to this line. Actually, decisions are imposed on the party by the party bureaucracy. The class struggle is the instrumentality that this party employs to accomplish its purpose and around which a whole theory and practice of strategy and tactics has been built up. Paradoxically, the communists would destroy democracy in order to achieve it.

There are, of course, many shadings among the left and right parties described in the preceding sections and in the methods which they employ. The capitalist and social democratic, or socialist, parties accept the democratic method, but this does not mean that all are committed to the democratization of the economy. In the United States today, as in all democratic countries, a titantic struggle is going on between powerful interest groups. Those who are opposed to any important changes in our economic system, who would like to see less, not more, of government regulation and ownership, control most of the economic resources of the country. These interests also largely control the principal agencies of communication—the press, the radio, the moving pictures, and have resources to command the services of the ablest of propagandists. The modern metropolitan daily newspaper is a big business enterprise operated primarily for profit. Studies of the social composition of the boards

of trustees of schools and higher institutions of learning have shown that their membership is drawn largely from this class. Labor unions, farmers' organizations, and various other organized civic groups and progressive and liberal political groups speak for a large section of wage earners, for the middle class in general. Labor unions have the advantage of large numbers, but they have been forced to carry on a long and bitter struggle for existence, a struggle that is never ended. Fascism, as set forth by Lawrence Dennis, who, in his *Coming American Fascism*,[1] frankly recognizes the struggle between the people and privilege, between economic classes in our society, would give complete control to the elite in society, which means to the class that already exercises the major control through ownership of the principal instruments of production and distribution.

What will be the outcome of this struggle? This is a question that must be faced squarely. It is difficult for the people to control our complex economy, even where political forms are democratic, even in countries with long experience with these forms. Can the method of democracy meet the supreme test that seems to be confronting it everywhere in the twentieth century?

The Relation of Ends and Means

In this discussion the desirability of the democratic way of life is assumed. No attempt will be made to demonstrate that men prefer freedom to *any* form of slavery. Our purpose is rather to examine, in the light of the democratic ideal, the meaning and significance of the choice of method that the American people must make and are making. This I do in the confident belief that the great majority of Americans will look with

[1] Lawrence Dennis, *Coming American Fascism*, Harper, 1936.

extreme disfavor on those methods that place democracy in jeopardy, once they understand the issues at stake and the problems involved. And again it should be emphasized that these are all fundamental problems of education, for one of the functions of education in a democracy is to inform men, and another is to provide those experiences for children and youth that will develop within them the capacities that a democracy requires of its citizens.

This brings us squarely to the problem of the relation of ends and means in human affairs. It is obvious that the task to be performed determines the tools to be employed. The farmer does not select a plow with which to mow hay. This principle is just as valid in social life. Means must be appropriate to ends, for it is obvious that means condition ends. The processes of autocracy cannot be employed to achieve the purposes of democracy. In the end they will defeat those purposes. A school whose procedures are authoritarian and autocratic will only condition youth, and teachers, too, to acceptance of authority. An economic and political system that denies to large masses of individuals economic security, often the very right to work, that denies them any effective control over the economy, may eventually render them incapable of independence of action. A political party that does not practice democracy in the conduct of its own affairs cannot be a school for democracy. It is per contra inculcating the habits of submission to mere authority. The dictatorship of the proletariat may profess democracy as its objective, but the fact of dictatorship will control the ends achieved. The writer is aware of no evidence in the history of the last twenty years that autocracy leads to anything but more autocracy—until such time as it may disintegrate and fall because it can no longer wield power.

These principles are illustrated by the brief and tragic history of the German republic. The German people had not had a long and extensive experience with democratic forms. They had from time immemorial had more experience of autocracy and authority, less of independence of thought and action, less of participation in the making of policies. Despite their highly developed culture, their preeminence in science, their efficiency in business and government, an overweening respect for officialdom was characteristic of the people. After the revolution, the republic left the old civil service pretty much undisturbed and relied largely on the old judiciary, the old diplomatic corps, the old officer class in the army, with what results the world can now see. The administration of the affairs of the republic was entrusted to men who knew and had been conditioned by methods of autocracy. Most of them did not believe much in democracy. The republic faltered. It was unable to deal effectively and promptly with the rising Nazis. Even Hitler's jailer in 1923 was a Nazi sympathiser.

The writer was told by intellectuals in Russia in 1937 that both democracy and dictatorship were growing stronger there. The dictatorship is supposed to protect the growing democracy. But this is a contradiction in terms. How can democracy grow stronger while dictatorship prevails in important areas of life? According to the Webbs, there is considerable freedom in Russia for criticism in local soviets and in trade-union meetings. But this freedom is strictly limited. The press is rigidly censored and controlled by the government, which, in turn, is under the effective control of the party. The people may not buy foreign papers. There is no genuine freedom of speech, no freedom publicly to criticize the government. At the end of twenty years, the state is not withering away but the dictatorship is more powerful

and ruthless than ever. There is no evidence of democracy within the party. What the exact conditions are in Russia, how long the present phase will last, what the final outcome will be, we cannot now know. Allowance must be made for the fact that only in this century have the Russian people had any experience with parliamentary government. But, with all possible allowances, the outlook for democracy in Russia in the near future does not seem bright; it seems to grow darker.

If a people are to establish democracy, they must progressively practice democracy. If democracy is to survive in the United States, the processes of democracy must be jealously guarded and practiced. When voting becomes a mere form that has little influence on policy because of the dominance of powerful forces that actually control the government in one way or another, democracy is in serious jeopardy. If the people are to control, they must control. Otherwise they will soon lose the power and the disposition to control. It remains to be seen what effect the methods of propaganda and censorship employed in the fascist countries will have on the people of those countries. There is evidence that they are losing all disposition and power to protest, for all political and economic life is a process of education. To come closer home, how can an American who, under our industrial and business system, works under direction all day and has no voice in controlling the policies of the enterprise in which he is employed, develop the outlook, the capacities, and the habits that citizens of a democracy must have if democracy is to endure? Will he not rather lose these qualities?

The old saying that as the twig is bent so is the tree inclined is true. The child who grows up in China becomes a Chinese, not a Frenchman, nor an American, nor an American Indian, and the anthropologists have

shown beyond possibility of doubt that it is not the skin, not the biological inheritance that makes the difference but the interaction between the individual and his social environment; and the environment is the conditioning factor. Every individual is a product of the culture in which he grows to maturity. He is the product of his experiences.

It follows that in a democracy all education, both in and out of the school, should be consciously designed to equip the individual for effective participation in a democratic society. The schools may be used and are employed in the authoritarian states to condition children and youth in habits of unquestioning obedience. The spirit that permeates and controls the school is, therefore, of paramount importance in a democracy, for the school is a means to an end, though education is also an end in itself. The means must not defeat the ends.

It is, then, essential that we enquire further into the meaning of democracy today, for the first step in the development of a program of education for democracy must be understanding of its meaning in all areas of life in our time.

The Meaning of Democracy

The concept of democracy has been one of long evolution. For its earliest beginnings we must go far back into antiquity, to the founders of the Christian religion, to the ancient Hebrews, to the Greek city state, and beyond. Democracy is more than a form of political government; it is a moral and social conception and way of life. All aspects of life are involved. Belief in the worth and dignity of human personality is the foundation of the democratic idea. In the words of Theodore Roosevelt, in a democracy:

We . . . believe: that human rights are supreme over all other rights; that wealth should be the servant and not the master of the people. We believe that when representative government does not absolutely represent the people it is not representative government at all. We test the worth of all men and all measures by asking how they contribute to the welfare of the men, women, and children of whom this nation is composed. We are engaged in one of the great battles of the age-long contest waged against privilege on behalf of the common welfare.

Democracy has its own system of moral and social values. It emphasizes the brotherhood of man, cooperation and not selfishness.

Democracy is government of, by, and for the people. This means not only government by consent but active participation by all citizens in the process. To this end freedom of discussion is essential. Political democracy, of course, takes many forms, depending on circumstances. The democracy of the Greek city state was a very direct democracy, but these states were small, and citizenship was limited, for the democracy rested on slavery. The town meeting met the needs of the small New England communities where every citizen could participate directly in the making of laws. In a large state or nation the device of representation must be used, based either on geography or on functional groups. In any event it is the people—that is, their interests—that must be represented. Policy flows from the people. But this does not mean that there is no place for authority in a democracy. Authority is essential, but it must be exercised by the chosen representatives of the people, in their interests, and always under their control.

Democracy has far-reaching economic implications for the modern world. Only free men can carry on a democracy, and, as we have seen, men who do not have eco-

nomic security and power are not free. Where such a state of affairs exists, authority is exercised by the forces that control the means of livelihood of men who have no economic freedom. A century ago, economic freedom meant economic individualism in the United States. The nature of our economy has so changed under economic individualism and industrialism that the problems of security now involve more of collective control and planning of many economic functions.

Democracy accepts social change as a fact and believes in the possibility and desirability of social progress. The question is, how can social change be directed in the interests of all members of society? Democracy places its reliance on experience and tested knowledge. It is thoroughly scientific and experimental in its outlook and method. This does not mean that long-term planning is impossible, but it does mean that planning should be based, as far as possible, on scientific data and that plans must always be subject to review in accordance with ways provided for by law, and open to criticism under the protection of the historic guarantees of civil liberty.

Democracy is, therefore, a positive and dynamic conception and way of life involving every aspect of a culture. It is not just the middle way, not merely the line of least resistance, not just a balancing of great social forces or the achievement of an equilibrium in society.

Education for Social Reconstruction

The analysis that we have made of the causes and nature of the social crisis, of the possibilities of American life, of the problem of method, and of the nature of democracy enables us to form some judgments as to the nature of the economic and social changes required by democracy in the United States as regards both objectives and procedures. It is only in the light of some such

conception that education can perform its rightful tasks in this critical period, for education should prepare men to cope intelligently and effectively with the problems of their time. This does not involve teaching of a detailed blue print for the new social order. An unalterable blue print would be inconsistent with the purposes of democracy, and to teach such a blue print would violate the principles of education in a democracy. If such a detailed blue print were possible or desirable, it would not be the peculiar function of educators to prepare it, though teachers must share in the making of economic and political policy in a democracy. But to say that the schools are not to teach the blue prints of a new order is not to say that education has no concern for the shape of the society of the future or is without guidance as to the nature of the changes that must be effected. Above all, it is essential to know the necessities and possibilities in the situation, for democracy need not be at the mercy of blind chance. Education must be concerned both with the process of effecting changes and with the purposes to be achieved. Otherwise, education will be aimless and futile.

The Problem of Economic and Social Planning and Control

Two words that stir deep emotions today are the words "collectivism" and "planning." Walter Lippmann, in his recent book, *The Good Society*, after tracing the growing trend toward collectivism since about 1870, asserts, "A collectivist society can exist only under an absolute state."[1] Mr. Lippmann would have us turn back to early nineteenth century liberalism. Mr. Lippmann further asserts that a planned society is possible only under war conditions—under a military regime. It is

[1] Walter Lippmann, *The Good Society*, Little Brown, 1937.

impossible, he says, for any planning board to foresee and provide for all the myriad wants of people in an advanced culture. Here we agree, but the point is irrelevant, for such detailed control of the life of the people is not an essential of planning. Planning should, on the contrary, aim to give more people more choices. Mr. Lippmann does recognize the trend toward collectivism in the capitalist democracies through the development of the giant corporate enterprise and regulatory measures of various kinds. And what is his remedy for the plight of our economy? Regulation through law! This remedy certainly involves planning, some conception of the "good society," and measures for achieving it. But at no point does Mr. Lippmann make a realistic analysis of the powerful vested economic interests in a society in which a few hundred men control nearly half of industry in a nation of 130,000,000 people, as in the United States today.[1]

What reason is there to suppose that the economic system that prevailed in the first half of the last century in the premachine age could be restored in all its pristine purity, assuming that any one would desire to restore it, any more than that the feudalism of the thirteenth century could be brought back to life in France? There is none. History does not repeat itself in that fashion. It would be as easy to rid ourselves of all science and machinery. The very division of labor that Mr. Lippmann says is characteristic of our society stands in the way of a return to an economy based on the self-contained farm and on handicrafts. There are, of course, degrees of integration and of collective control and different methods of collective control. The people have been in various ways extending their control over the economy

[1] Adolf A. Berle, Jr., and Gardiner C. Means, *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*, Macmillan, 1934.

in the last seventy years. The question is not whether we want a collective economy but what form of social control we desire. Do we want the economy to be controlled by a few, primarily in their own interests, or by the people, in the interest of all? How much of the "free enterprise" system do we want to keep? Shall we move toward fascism or toward socialism? If toward the latter, how far do we propose to go?

And so it is with planning. Even Mr. Lippmann grants the necessity of knowing our land, mineral, and forest resources and of making intelligent use of them. He says:

> The land and what is under it, the seas and the highways, are the patrimony of all generations to come, and all rights of private property in this patrimony must, therefore, be subject to the condition that this natural inheritance will not be wasted or destroyed, that it will, on the contrary, be enriched. . . . The conclusion is undeniable that conservation, in its broadest sense, including the zoning of urban and agricultural land, is a paramount obligation of a liberal state.[1]

This is planning, and important steps forward have been taken in this field. Furthermore, rationalization is the very essence of industry in the power age. Again the question is not whether we shall have planning, but by whom and for whom, *cui bono*. It was in large measure the waste and inefficiency that grows out of planning simply for profits—the more and the quicker, the better—that brought us to the plight we are in. Of this I think there can be no doubt. If the problems of our economy are to be solved, thought must be given to these problems. Steps must be taken to ensure that the resources of the country are utilized for the benefit of the people. That is planning. It is unthinkable that in a country with such great resources millions should continue to live without

[1] Lippmann, *op. cit.*

economic security or that the present economic stratification of American society with its injustice to more than half our people can be indefinitely endured.

How far and how rapidly we shall need to proceed depends on many factors. We should go as far in the direction of social control and ownership of the instruments of production and distribution as is necessary to achieve our purposes and no further. Private ownership of personal property, including houses, is surely an essential. Our aim must be better houses and more personal possessions for nine-tenths of our people. There are also many values in private ownership of productive property, in the so-called private enterprise system, that should be retained as long as possible. The division line may be somewhere between big key industries that are sick or unmanageable through regulation on the one hand and healthy, well-balanced and well-behaved large industries and small businesses on the other. It is absolutely essential that no privileged group be permitted to retain economic power so great that it virtually controls not only industry but the state. There is no reason why in the United States a plurality of forms should not exist side by side—capitalism, state and municipal socialism, and cooperatives—what J. M. Keynes has called "the particular amalgam of private capitalism and state socialism which is the only practicable recipe for present conditions."[1] In this connection we undoubtedly have much to learn from the Scandinavian countries.

The essential consideration is that our resources be employed for the welfare of our people. Folklore and superstition must not prevent the use of our political and social institutions for the accomplishment of this task. It is unthinkable that with millions without work because

[1] J. M. Keynes, *New Statesman and Nation* (London), issue of Jan. 28, 1939.

of the breakdown of private industry the government should stand idly by.

The Democratic Method

How shall these changes be brought about? The American people proclaimed the right of revolution in their Declaration of Independence. But the necessity for revolution arises only when the people find it impossible to control their government and make it an instrument for the solution of their economic problems. The institutions of political democracy, by providing for changes even in the basic law itself, have opened the way for changes in the political system and in the economy that should render revolution unnecessary. As Professor George Mead has expressed it, the establishment of political democracy "institutionalized the process of revolution." Although the fact of revolution and the right of revolution cannot be denied, revolution is *not* the method of democracy. Revolution will come only when the processes of democracy break down. Our task is to make them work in the solution of the economic problems that confront us.

Furthermore, as every informed observer knows, revolution in the United States could result only in the establishment of a fascist regime of some kind. There is no danger of revolution by the left radicals in this country. These parties are weak and divided. There is real danger, however, from fascist-minded reactionaries who do not hesitate to take the law into their own hands in industrial disputes, who do not hesitate to deny men their civil rights of freedom of speech and assembly, and who will, once aroused, recognize no authority but superior force. The La Follette senatorial investigation of violations of civil liberties has shown that in many instances

large industrial corporations have employed their own spies and armed forces and have at times controlled the police and even the National Guard. The political control which Huey Long established over Louisiana and his share-the-wealth movement had many of the earmarks of fascism, as do the mouthings of Father Coughlin. Such phenomena as the Hague regime in Jersey City are clearly fascist in tendency and very ominous. Professor Gellerman[1] has documented beyond cavil certain tendencies in the American Legion that are clearly anti-democratic, though many of the members of this organization would make it an instrument for the defense of democracy. More sinister was the rise of the Ku Klux Klan in the early twenties. Dangerous are those "civic" organizations that today, in the name of the constitution, oppose all reconstructive measures as un-American, as do certain uniformed "patriotic" societies that are fomenting racial prejudice. It is from general directions such as these that the threat of autocracy and violence comes in this country, and their method is thoroughly un-American.

The crisis in which we find ourselves will continue until there is a redistribution of economic power between the social classes of this country or until the country finds itself under the iron heel of a fascist dictatorship, American version. If a satisfactory solution is to be found for our economic difficulties, it will be through the political action of those who live by work for wages or salaries and who do not now exercise that control over the economy that assures them security and freedom. The believers in democracy must appeal to the masses who are without security and freedom but who have the ballot. But this need not mean class war.

[1] William B. Gellerman, *The American Legion as Educator*, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1938.

Nor can it be too strongly emphasized that most individuals in all ranks and classes of American society believe in democracy, recognize the inefficiencies and injustices that have created the crisis that confronts us, and are prepared to make sacrifices for democracy. The appeal of the friends of democracy should, then, be to all the people. The role of the intellectual classes is a critical one. At no time in history have the intellectuals and the technologists wielded so much influence as in contemporary society, not even in the France of the eighteenth century. The million teachers of the country as citizens and as intellectuals have an important part to play in this process. And for them, as we shall see in the last chapter, neutrality is impossible.

A Realignment of Political Parties Needed

As we have already pointed out, political parties in this country no longer give expression to the realities of the economic and political situation. There is no reason why Carter Glass and Herbert Hoover or Maury Maverick and Robert La Follette should belong to different parties. The interests of democracy demand the formation of a new party that will include the progressive wings of the two major parties, the progressives of Wisconsin, the farmer-labor parties in the western states, and the labor parties that have been organized in some states, and that should include the socialists. This party would work in the American democratic tradition. The terminology of the Marxian parties and their tactics are not acceptable to Americans. The Marxian analysis was probably the most important and illuminating contribution to social theory in the nineteenth century. But Marx lived and wrote in Europe in the nineteenth century, and his thought was conditioned by his age and culture. There is no place in

this country for the tactics of the party line or of the class struggle as developed by the communist parties. These tactics are utterly alien to America and to democracy. The new party must be utterly realistic about the economic situation and the class alignments that have been produced by industrial capitalism, but its methods must be those of democracy.

In the domestic field this party would move toward a gradual socialization of the principal utilities and key industries that are sick or recalcitrant. It would be possible, then, to develop a coordinated, efficient, cheap system of transportation. What an example the railroads have been of bad planning, inefficiency, and exploitation of a public service not adequately controlled by the people! Public ownership of power should bring cheap electric energy to city and country. The Federal government should control all mineral deposits. The program of the new party would call for firm protection of the right of workers to bargain collectively. Once in power, it would enact adequate minimum-wages-and-hours laws and laws for the protection of women and youth in industry. Child labor in industry would be abolished. An adequate program of social security for everyone would be inaugurated. Cooperatives would be fostered in every way possible. Social services, including education, would be greatly extended. The government would effectively enter, on a long-time plan, those fields of investment that no longer offer adequate returns to private capital. Government would not hesitate to put men to work at good wages on public works or even, in time of depression, at producing the goods which people need. Such a government would not be bound by mere folklore.

If such a party were opposed by a frankly conservative party, the political situation would at once be greatly improved. The purpose of the conservative party

would be the preservation of as much of the system of private enterprise as possible. The two parties would be separated by genuine political differences, but the conservative party would not be one of reaction. It would accept most of the objectives of the liberal party but eschew many of its concrete proposals, though many, such as regulation, social security and other social legislation, and the development of social services, it would accept. This party would claim to be more efficient in government. It would operate wholly within the democratic tradition and would perform an indispensable function of constructive criticism. Such a conservative policy has sometimes been referred to in England as "tory socialism."

The Problem of Foreign Relations

The problem of the relation of the United States to other nations cannot be omitted from such an analysis as the foregoing. The economies and the cultures of the world were never so closely knit together as today. Ours is an age of contradictions. Technology has created an interdependent world, but nationalism is rampant in this world. After an unprecedented armament race with its colossal waste of human energy and material resources, the actuality of war between great powers again threatens the very foundations of civilization. The world struggle, as we pointed out earlier, is between two ways of life, the authoritarian and democratic. The lines are often not clear. The struggle is on in every country between the forces of reaction and of democracy. But the main issues should be clear, and that another world war will not only set back the program of economic reconstruction in every country but threaten civilization itself likewise should be clear.

This government should strive to live at peace with all countries, for peace is essential to the task of reconstruction that confronts us. If isolation were possible, civilization might be preserved on this continent in the holocaust that seems to be approaching. But the integrated world economy of the twentieth century makes complete isolation for America impossible. Moreover, we cannot, in the opinion of the writer, be indifferent to the fate of democracy in other countries. The conquest of Spain by Italy and Germany and the enthronement of Franco's fascist regime there, with the democracies lifting not a finger (worse, actually making defeat certain by the incredible policy of "nonintervention" and through our neutrality act, which certainly was not actual neutrality), the destruction of democratic Czechoslovakia, and the invasion of China and now Poland threaten the peace and security of all democratic nations. When all the rest of the world is fascist—and that eventuality is distinctly within the realm of possibilities —the prospect for democracy in the United States will be dark indeed. The prediction of Mussolini that the twentieth century will be the century of fascism, as the nineteenth was the century of liberalism, will then have come true.

And this is not to advocate a policy of world meddling or of pulling the chestnuts of the British Empire out of the fire. Nor is it to advocate assistance to governments in the achievement of any purposes that are not democratic. It *is* to say that a positive foreign policy is better than a negative one, for a policy of extreme isolation is, after all, a merely negative policy. Much could have been done, short of war, through economic pressure, extension of credits, the sale of arms to democratic governments, embargoes on the sale of arms to aggressors, and through moral support to help Loyalist

Spain and the Chinese government. Such a policy would, of course, involve risks. It is almost a certainty, however, that America cannot withdraw from the contemporary world and that a policy of isolation will, in the end, involve equal, if not greater, risks of war. It would seem that a positive policy of collaboration with other democracies in the directions indicated still offers the only way by which the United States can contribute to the achievement of world peace and the strengthening of democracy throughout the world.

Civil Liberties as Means and Ends

The most important political objective must be the protection of our civil liberties, freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion, and, I would add, the protection of freedom of teaching in our schools and higher institutions of learning. To this end there must be cooperation of all men of good will who believe in these values. The seriousness of the threat to the way of democracy cannot be overemphasized. For its ultimate defense we should be prepared to sink all other differences. And one of the gravest dangers to democracy in time of crisis is the tendency of liberals and radicals, following perfectionist ideals, to split into warring sects. This tendency spelled disaster in Germany and in Spain. It should not be allowed to happen here. It is imperative that all believers in democracy, regardless of differences of view on economic problems, unite for the maintenance of the processes of democracy and of our civil liberties. The conservative party and the liberal party described in the preceding pages could and should collaborate in the defense of our democratic institutions and processes.

Civil liberties, then, are both means and ends. It is only through free discussion that a democracy can function, while freedom of speech, assembly, and press are marks of a free and truly civilized society.

V

EDUCATION FOR DEMOCRACY IN OUR TIME

SALIENT and striking facts relating to universal popular education are the recency of its origin, its magnitude and complexity, its enormous potentialities for influencing the minds of men, and the significance moderns have attached to it. Already state systems of education have served varied and often conflicting purposes. Popular education is not always a creative and liberating influence, for it can be controlled by whatever forces control the state. It may be employed either as an agency of enlightenment or merely for purposes of social control.

It was the liberals of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who carried on the agitation for free schools. They considered education foundational to a free society. But the liberals never gained complete control of education in any of the Western countries, though everywhere the state was, until the World War at least, constantly being liberalized. Moreover, liberalism, despite the influence of the great intellectual currents of the century and of the socialist movement, was nationalist in temper. The liberals advocated national self-determination and the liberation of nationalities, such as the Poles, the Greeks, and the Irish, and they believed in teaching

patriotism. It is the less surprising, therefore, that under the more or less conscious tutelage of the more conservative elements usually in control of the state civic loyalty was identified with loyalty to the *status quo* and to the policies of those in control of the state. Thus the whole prewar German educational system was made an instrument of national policy. In the German *Volkschule* and secondary schools the masses were taught patriotism, loyalty to German imperialism, and distrust of France. The French schools were employed to create, in the words of Carlton Hayes, "a nation of patriots." Today the schools of Italy and Germany teach unquestioning allegiance to the fascist state, and the new Russian schools instill loyalty to the communist regime and its economic and social purposes. It is true that the picture was, until the postwar period, never wholly of one color in any country. Education in all Western countries was throughout the nineteenth century a liberating influence. It is indeed doubtful whether any dictatorship can ever *completely* bend popular education to its own purposes. In one sense education, since it modifies behavior, is always a form of control, but the word is employed here to denote habituation to the purposes of ruling groups or classes that do not represent the interests of the people. Plainly, then, educational policies always involve ethical values and choices and major social decisions. Both the content and method of education are affected by these decisions.

The Nature of Social Education

From the standpoint of social purpose, two conceptions of the educative process require our examination.

According to one conception, the explanation of learning is found in the operation of the stimulus-

response mechanism. Learning or education is in large measure a process of habituation. There can be no question of the importance of this mechanism or of the process of habituation in education. But the weight of scientific evidence, both psychological and sociological, is against a narrowly mechanistic conception of learning and of education. According to the second view, then, education is, or can and should be, a more creative process. Man has always ventured. He has acquired new patterns of behavior. He is moulded by a culture, but he also can and does modify culture. As a result of a long process of biological and cultural evolution, he has acquired the capacity to see relationships, to recognize and find solutions to problems, to invent, actually to create new patterns of behavior. The second conception of the educative process, therefore, emphasizes the active, experiential, and creative aspects of learning.

The validity of these conceptions of the nature of education depends in considerable measure on the purposes to be achieved. Where conformity is sought, education becomes of necessity, in large measure, a process of conditioning. Authoritarianism relies on this method in all areas in which conformity is desired. At best, according to this conception, education is a process of discovering absolute truth rather than of cultivating the creative capacities of the individual. This method is employed today by the authoritarian dictatorships in most areas of human relations. It is evident, however, that from the other point of view this conception of education is wholly inadequate, for the reason that such conditioning tends to enslave and not to free the mind, to atrophy and not to develop the individual's creative abilities. Habituation and the mastery of skills must always be a part of education, but whenever these processes become all of education for any individual or

social class, education ceases to be education in the truest sense.

Reasoning by analogy is always dangerous, but the work of the surgeon may be employed to illustrate the relation that should obtain between habits, skills, and intelligence, for habit has an indispensable function to play in any scheme of life. The surgeon must master certain skills so that they become almost automatic—"second nature," as we say. The surgeon who has mastered these skills has gained freedom to operate in accordance with his best judgment. The truly great surgeon is characterized both by his skill and by his judgment, but he would not be great if he could not subordinate his skill to his judgment, if he had not acquired that quality of mind that enables him to discard one technique in favor of a better one or to modify a technique in the presence of a new situation in accordance with a penetrating analysis of the situation. The process of conditioning is, then, only one phase of a true educative process. Beyond this level, education and conditioning become in fact contradictory terms. The highest form of education involves the development of capacity for criticism and evaluation, of independence of thought and action.

From all this it follows that the aim of education should be to equip the individual the more wisely to reflect upon and to guide his own experience. This is the instrumental function of thinking. Indeed, thinking can have no other functions than those of critical analysis, decision, action, verification, and evaluation. The individual is, then, truly educated to the extent that he is capable of thoughtful self-direction. Thus it has been said that education is a "process of experience reconstructing experience." The process of critical evaluation, if it is extended to all areas of experience, assumes that a

thing may be judged good or bad by the individual in accordance with some system of values which *to him* seems valid. In a democracy this means by the way in which it serves human needs. The conception of finalities in the realm of human affairs in a changing world is rejected. Life becomes truly creative. By taking thought, men can, within limits, recreate their environment, mould it in accordance with their aspirations.

Intelligence and Loyalties

This interpretation of the meaning of education raises the question of the relation of criticism and independence of thinking to the development of loyalties. If each individual is to do his own thinking, to judge policies and actions by consequences in terms of some system of values acceptable to himself but also subject to constant modification in the light of experience, will not the end result be anarchy, every man a law unto himself? How can social stability exist unless it be based on moral and social verities, on political and social principles as unchangeable as the laws of nature? The human race has always desired that emotional and mental security that comes from a feeling of certainty, and throughout the history of the race the "quest for certainty," to borrow Dewey's phrase, has gone on.

The social thinkers of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century were searching for the natural laws of society just as the physical scientists were searching for the laws of the physical world. But in this search they were doomed to disappointment. As the boundaries of knowledge have been pushed farther and farther back by modern science and scholarship, a world of relativity rather than a domain of absolute certainty has been discovered in the realm of human affairs.

Indeed, the physical sciences, too, have revealed a world of motion in which the laws of Newtonian physics, once regarded as absolute, operate in a larger frame of relativity. Man has found increasingly in the modern world that his reliance must be placed in intelligence. This does not mean that there are no enduring values in life. It does mean that there are no ethical absolutes, in the traditional and authoritarian sense of that term. The vast changes that the long centuries have brought alter conditions even in the moral realm. Only that is good which fosters human intelligence and promotes human welfare. A political and social system that would be acceptable in a primitive tribe is rejected by free men in an advanced culture. Morals are relative to cultures. It follows that when man becomes aware of the nature of culture and of social processes, he finds that his destiny is to a considerable extent in his own hands. Within limits set by the physical environment, by his own biological endowment, and by such stubborn cultural facts as modern science and technology, he can mould the world increasingly in terms of his own choices.

Every interpretation of the nature and purpose of education involves, then, an interpretation of the nature of things and of the nature of culture—a world outlook or philosophy. Opposed to the traditional absolutist, authoritarian conception of the process of knowing and of values is that of the modern world which rejects all authority except experience, including study, investigation, experimentation, and research, refined to the highest possible degree. This is the pragmatic or scientific view which looks for explanations of natural and social phenomena only within the natural order itself, for this method can know no other order. This world outlook or philosophy exalts the functions of

science and of human intelligence. It is, as we have already seen, the philosophy of democracy.

We are now in a better position to understand the problem of building loyalties in a democracy. It is a difficult problem, more difficult in the short run at least, than the inculcation of loyalties under an authoritarian regime. But I do not believe the problem insoluble, for if it is, then human intelligence is unable to solve the problems of a free society. The fact is that human intelligence has, particularly in the last four or five hundred years, laid the foundation of a free society. It is this intellectual achievement and heritage that is being challenged in the contemporary world. The outlines of the problem of loyalties in a democratic society—for only in a democracy can men be free—seem clear. A democracy must foster in its members loyalty to the principles of a free society. This may seem trite and even tautological, but it is more than that. As we have said, freedom of thought is both an end and a means in such a society. It would seem obvious, then, that a democracy can foster loyalty to the great objectives of democracy, individual and social welfare, and to those processes and institutions essential to the promotion of these purposes. It will foster those values that the race has found good. But it will always apply the pragmatic test to social processes and institutions.

There is no escaping the conclusion, then, that all education proceeds of necessity within some frame of reference. Education occurs always in time and space; it takes place in a particular social setting. It is plain that every national system of education in the contemporary world is an expression of the culture that supports it and reflects the philosophy or the conflicts that dominate that culture. If a society is characterized by stresses and strains, by uncertainty, by an internal

struggle for power, these phenomena will be reflected in its educational system. We can see this in French, Italian, German, Russian, and British education. It is high time that we see it in American education. If education is to serve definite social purposes, it must embody these purposes in its theory and practices. These are the considerations and necessities which make the problem of education so important in the remaining democracies of the world at this particular juncture in history.

The Political Purpose of Education in the United States

There has been a determined effort in our generation to neutralize American education socially. This takes the form of pressure from various groups to prevent the study of controversial social issues in the school, such as the problems involved in the relation of labor and capital or proposals for the reconstruction of society. Teachers of known liberal view have on occasion been driven out of the schools. Even prominent educators take the view that the teacher must be neutral in the classroom, that the schools must not indoctrinate, must not even "indoctrinate" a belief in democracy, or, I presume, in the methods of science. Can such a policy of neutrality serve the interests of American democracy? Is it consistent with the historic purpose of American education? The advocates of such neutrality would do well to read a little American history.

Free schools were established in this country for a definite social purpose, the education of all citizens in order that they might intelligently discharge their responsibilities as citizens, and this in order that the great experiment in republican government, that is,

in democracy, might not fail in the United States. According to Charles A. Beard:

> The men who had set up the new government after the Revolution were, as a matter of course, especially concerned with political education, with the preparation of the people for self-government. . . . The preservation of these processes of democracy was assured in part, the founders believed, by laws and institutions guaranteeing freedom of the press, discussion, and decision, but they knew that paper guarantees were not enough. Knowledge and a moral sense were required to sustain democratic processes and to make them constructive rather than destructive.[1]

Franklin, Jefferson, and others of the founders believed popular education and the development of colleges and universities essential to popular government and gave much thought to the promotion of educational institutions. Madison once said that a system of popular government not founded on popular education would result either in a "farce or a tragedy or both." In his Farewell Address, Washington said: "Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." Washington left a part of his estate for the founding of a national university at the national capital. Jefferson drafted a plan for popular education, and he was the founder of the University of Virginia.

Fifty years after the Revolution the battle for the establishment of free schools was fought out. It was the proponents of liberalism and democracy then as always who wanted schools for the people. The first organization

[1] Charles A. Beard, *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy*, National Education Association, 1937. This monograph was written for the Educational Policies Commission of the N. E. A.

of working men in this country demanded free schools for their children as essential to the preservation of their political liberties. Mann, Carter, Barnard, and other educational leaders of this period, the "founding fathers" of our free schools, saw clearly that democratic government was dependent on free schools and that the first duty of the school was to give the individual that education that would enable him to exercise understandingly and intelligently the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. *It was no mere matter of chance that free schools were established at the very time that property and religious qualifications for voting were being abolished and the principle of manhood suffrage firmly established.* It is true that the founders of our free schools had other purposes in mind. The schools would raise the cultural level of the people. They would equip the individual to play his part in the economic life of the country and to better his own economic position in society. Both of these were and still are laudable purposes, foundational to a democratic society. But the needs of a government of free men were primary in the minds of the founders of free public schools.

The demands that democracy makes on education are much more complex and extensive today than in the preindustrial American culture of a century ago. A public common school that taught the people to read, write, and cipher along with some of the elements of geography and history and that provided an introduction, at least, to English literature, supplemented by the private and semipublic academies and colleges for the education of leaders, met the needs of that time very well. The one-room rural school, with its winter term of a few weeks or months, and the academy were thoroughly functional for that period and were truly characteristic American institutions. They brought literacy

to the general public and instilled loyalty to and some understanding of our social and political institutions. Even in that period the most thoughtful of American educators believed that the essential social function of public education extended beyond that of placing the individual in possession of a few simple tools, such as the "three R's" represented. In the words of Horace Mann:

> Since the achievement of American independence, the universal and ever-repeated argument in favor of free schools has been that the general intelligence which they are capable of diffusing, and which can be imparted by no other human instrumentality, is indispensable to the continuance of a republican government. . . .
>
> . . . It becomes, then, a momentous question, whether the children in our schools are educated in reference to themselves and their private interests only, or with a regard to the great social duties and prerogatives that await them in after-life.[1]

But the task of the school in that society was, after all, a relatively simple one. Life on the frontier, on the farm, in the shop, in the community, was in many ways more educative than is life for most Americans today. The farm was more educative than the assembly line of a modern factory that requires not initiative and independence of judgment but little more than a certain manual dexterity and adjustment to the machine. In those days institutions such as the home and the church carried much larger educational responsibilities. Community life was much more integrated and homogeneous in outlook and much more certainly inculcated in the individual qualities that developing American democracy required.

[1] From the Tenth and Ninth Annual Reports, quoted in *Horace Mann, His Ideas and Ideals*, J. E. Morgan, National Home Library Foundation, 1936.

It is truly difficult to grasp the full import of the cultural changes that have been wrought by scientific discoveries and technological advances and by such factors as the conquest of the West in the United States, the influx of immigrants from Europe, and the urbanization of life in these hundred years, and the extent to which education and the school have been affected by these changes. No longer either the economic or educational agency that it once was, the home has been profoundly affected by changed social and economic conditions. The church no longer exercises the moral authority that it once did. The American community is no longer so homogeneous in its ideas and outlook. There has been, decade by decade, a gradual transfer of educational responsibilities to the school. As James E. Russell has pointed out, it was not generally considered two or three generations ago that the school should assume a direct responsibility for moral training or even for civic education in the current sense of that term.

Schooling has now been made compulsory and the period of education greatly extended. If the industrial processes of the modern world are dependent on a widespread diffusion of general and technical knowledge, the social and political processes of the age demand even more an appropriate social education. If republican government was dependent on popular education in the days of James Madison, political education for both youth and adults is far more essential to democracy today. Political education, in the very nature of things, must include technical and professional education, education for work. Democracy also has its deep ethical implications; hence education for democracy involves moral education appropriate to the democratic ideal, not through preaching but through living.

If I seem to labor this point, it is only because of its overwhelming importance for us in the United States today. The American free school was never intended to be socially neutral. It was instituted primarily to educate the people for democracy, and political education is today its most insistent responsibility. The reader is aware that no narrow and restricted type of political education is meant here but rather that type of education that will most adequately equip the people to find democratic solutions of the critical problems that confront them in the twentieth century.

No better evidence that political education is the first problem of the schools today could be found than the current discussions relative to the social functions and problems of education and the attempts of various groups in society to control social education through legislation and through various direct pressures on boards of control, administrators, and teachers. For twenty years now a controversy has raged over the problem of indoctrination. Teachers and administrators and the lay public are today preoccupied with the problem of social education. A vast literature on the subject is appearing in books and journals devoted to the consideration of the moral, social, economic, and political problems of the age. Political education, broadly interpreted, is the *raison d'être* of the public school. And this purpose was never more compelling nor more urgent than at the present time. It is a purpose that needs to be much more widely understood.

Education for Democracy in Our Time

This brings us squarely to the problem of education for democracy in our time. In the light of the analysis made in the preceding pages, the main outlines of a social program for education begin to emerge clearly.

It is evident, in the first place, that if democracy is to be conserved and fully realized, the American people must understand the meaning of democracy, both in its historical development and in its social bearings and implications for the world of today. They must understand that democracy is more than a form of government, that as a way of life it has deep implications for every aspect of life, that a society cannot long maintain democracy in certain areas of life while violating it in other areas. The people must see that economics and politics are always indissolubly connected, that democracy has profound concern for the economic well-being of the individual and that the economic well-being of all is essential to the continuance of democracy. They must gain a clear comprehension of the moral, aesthetic, and social bearings and implications of democracy in American life. Democracy values above all else the worth and dignity of human personality. It is, therefore, intolerant of special privilege. The utilization of human beings as mere machines, as mere instruments of industry or of the state is a negation of the values of democracy.

The first responsibility of organized education in our time is, then, to enable children, youth, and adults to acquire this understanding of democracy and its problems. Every part of the educational system and every area of education is involved, the university no less than the high school, the arts and the sciences as well as the social studies. Nor can the process of education be merely one of "acquiring knowledge" in the traditional sense. Knowledge is of fundamental importance. The way in which knowledge is acquired and the attitudes built in the process are also of vital importance. Knowledge is effective, is really knowledge for the individual, as it enters into and guides his actions.

It is especially vital that children and youth gain understanding of the reliance of democracy on the methods of intelligence, on the most exact scientific methods of assembling and verifying data for utilization in the formulation of policy, and practice in the application of these methods and techniques to problems of critical social import and of concern to them. They should acquire the habit of appraising policies by their effect on the welfare of the people, grow in ability to do so, and act accordingly. They should learn that traditions are good to the extent that they contribute to the general welfare, that the traditional should be accepted as good or rejected in the light of a critical analysis in terms of the values of democracy. Scientific and experimental in its outlook and practice, democracy rejects authoritarianism, though it makes a place for authority. In short, the American people need to gain effective understanding of the intellectual bases of democracy and of the crisis in thought arising from the conflict between two great value systems in the contemporary world. It is not argued here that every individual citizen can or will come to a clear understanding of these intellectual and moral problems in all their complex and subtle ramifications. It *is* argued that the large majority of individuals are, intellectually, capable of some comprehension of the main points of difference between the democratic and the authoritarian views of life and conceptions of human welfare. If not, then it would seem that democracy will indeed eventually prove unworkable.

Education for democracy involves understanding of the great social trends and problems of our time. It is imperative that Americans understand, before it is too late, the irresistible trend away from the economic individualism of the early nineteenth century toward a

more closely integrated economy that is necessitating a continuous extension of social control over the economy. Understanding of how modern methods of production have brought insecurity to millions of workers who no longer exercise control over the tools and processes of production and distribution is imperative for all. Various proposals for the solution of our economic problems are bidding for support, ranging all the way from fascism to communism. Organized labor and the organized farmers are struggling for greater economic security. How much of the private-enterprise system can or should be retained in a society of free men? How can the economy of abundance now possible be realized? The trend toward economic planning seems irresistible. How can planning be managed so as to free and not regiment a population? All these problems and many more besides are problems for study in school, college, and university, in adult-education classes and forums. Democracy will be secure only to the extent that the people are informed and have acquired the capacity to keep themselves informed and to think and to act in their own interests in these areas.

Culture and Democracy

Democracy utterly rejects the age-old belief that a privileged leisure class is essential to the building of a rich culture. In a democracy culture cannot be the possession of the few but must be brought within reach of all. Education for democracy means, therefore, not less but more of emphasis on what has always been known as the "cultural values," and it insists that these values be made available to all, not merely to those who come from the more favored families and who can attend favored elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities and enjoy travel and other cultural advantage. Democracy's school will seek to

develop the individual's capacities for appreciation and enjoyment not only in the arts but in all areas of knowledge and experience. It will strive to develop his creative abilities and to give him opportunity for expression in whatever medium appeals to him. It will give much attention to health and to personal and social living in all their aspects. The "newer" fields, such as home economics, health and physical education, and all the arts have indispensable contributions to make to his education. Education that is concerned only with the intellectual or with certain skills of a vocational character becomes sterile, in time actually anti-intellectual. The arts and the development of the human body should again be accorded something of the dignity and importance accorded to them by the Greeks. But it is fallacious to try to draw a line between the fine and practical arts.

If we are to build a richer culture in the America of tomorrow, we cannot be indifferent to the enrichment of living in our day. Social reformers, of all people, should be deeply concerned with the preservation and enrichment of the enduring values of our culture, but, unfortunately, often they are seemingly indifferent to or oblivious of broader cultural interests. The chief arguments against revolution as a method of social change is the loss of culture that this method always involves.

Education for democracy, then, involves a conception of the kind of culture that is desirable and possible for the future in our country and of the educational processes and institutions that will contribute positively to the realization of these desirabilities and possibilities. Again, the complexities of these problems must be noted. To what extent should we strive for uniformity, to what extent for the preservation of variety, in speech, dress,

manners, in aesthetic forms in music, the graphic and plastic arts, architecture, community planning, and the like? Although many of these problems lie beyond the range of the present discussion, it must be evident that a dead uniformity would be a perversion of the possibilities of a democratic society. Democracy must prize variety and richness in life because it values the unique contribution that each individual and each community can make to living. It must be obvious, too, that the role of the arts is as important as that of science or politics in a democracy.

Above all, it is the problem of education and, therefore, of the school to inculcate in the individual understanding of the processes of democracy and loyalty to its objectives, its processes, and its rich cultural possibilities. Here it must again be emphasized that the civil liberties of free speech, free assembly, and a free press are both means and ends. It is inconceivable that culture can flourish in a situation in which these values do not prevail. For the advancement of culture the school must be intellectually free.

Democracy in Education

Education for democracy, then, implies democracy in education. Only a school that itself practices democracy in all its operations can teach democracy. Means must be appropriate to the ends to be achieved. These principles hold with respect to the control and administration of the school and to methods of teaching.

Method in education rests on two foundations, on the biological nature of the individual and on cultural or social purposes. Obviously, the educator in a democracy should determine his method in the light of all that biological and psychological research has revealed with reference to the nature of human nature, bearing in mind

always that human nature is a function both of the biological organism and of the culture in which the individual lives, of the interaction between the organism and its physical and cultural environment. All that modern psychology has taught us about the individual must be utilized in the process of education for democracy. Economy and effectiveness of learning are of the utmost importance. And this scientific knowledge and its attendant techniques and skills must be employed for, and not against, democracy. For we have seen that the process of conditioning, for example, about which the psychologists have taught us so much, is *the* process of teaching loyalty to authoritarian regimes. Every technique that modern clinical psychology has developed, every insight that the various schools of psychology—behavioristic, Gestalt, Freudian, and others—have given us must be employed in democracy's school, subject to the purposes of democracy.

But it is primarily from the purposes of a society that the methods of its education must be derived. Democracy is the only social and political system that can utilize to the full the experiential nature of all learning and education. It will place a premium always on experience, critically evaluated, on self-directed activity on the part of the learner. Since independent thinking and cooperative effort are essentials of democracy, these will be emphasized in its methods of education and the school must provide for these experiences. The methods and techniques of research will be taught. Libraries and laboratories are prime essentials. The community itself will always be an educational laboratory. Activity, intellectual and social, on the part of the learner, participation in social processes within both the school and community are essential. The problems of society will not be shunned but will become subjects of study,

for thinking really occurs only when the individual is confronted by a problem to be solved.

These issues open up many problems, some of which will be considered in the chapters that follow, many of which lie beyond the purview of this discussion.

Education and Indoctrination

There remains to be considered the problem of indoctrination and whether what is advocated here is education or merely propaganda for a particular social program which I have elected to call democracy. For two decades or more, now, the controversy over indoctrination has been waged in American education. Much heat has been generated, and more often the discussion has confused rather than clarified the problem of social education. The opponents of "indoctrination" have held that if teaching and learning are so managed as to lead to some predetermined outcome, the process is not truly educative but rather a process of imposition and, therefore, antidemocratic. Imposition and education they consider a contradiction in terms.

The opponents of "indoctrination" are by no means agreed as to either the nature or purposes of social education. Various points of view are discernible. One group is deeply concerned that the school should provide educational experiences that will equip the individual for active and effective participation in a democratic society. They want the school to build in the individual those attitudes, understandings, and social skills that democracy requires. They have been perhaps the leading advocates of the "activity program" which makes the individual a more active participant in both school and community life. They want the controversial problems of contemporary life brought into the classroom for study and discussion. They want the school to be a

positive creative, social force for the preservation and fuller realization of democracy. But nothing must be "imposed." That would stunt rather than cultivate capacities for critical evaluation of conditions and proposals. The individual must do his own thinking and reach his own conclusions.

Others hold that the business of the school is *education* and that education has nothing to do with the inculcation of either social beliefs or social attitudes and habits. This school of thought contends that it is "the right of the learner to learn, but not of the teacher to teach." The teacher should not take sides or express his point of view. He should merely preside over the discussion and see that it is carried on fairly, preserving a strict neutrality. In such a school, it would seem, the teacher could not be deeply and actively concerned that the members of the group for which he was responsible really gained an understanding of democracy in its economic and moral bearings and implications today, for that would be taking sides; it would be teaching a point of view; it would be imposition; *indoctrination!* This doctrine seems to provide a means of escape for administrators and teachers who shrink from the difficulties of the study of controversial issues—and this *in the name of education.*

To the writer there is not much discernible difference between these views so far as outcomes are concerned. The danger is that in either instance the product will be individuals with a sentimental attachment to democracy, or to the symbols of democracy, but with a very foggy conception of the realities with which democracy must come to grips in the contemporary world. All who are concerned for the welfare of democracy will do well to be on their guard against these arguments against "indoctrination," even when advanced by those of

known liberal outlook who really desire that the school serve the purposes of democracy. We may expect that the defenders of the economic and social *status quo* will, in the name of "democracy," increasingly oppose all "indoctrination" in the schools and that they will label as indoctrination all objective study of critical social trends, problems, and proposals for social reconstruction.

This problem of indoctrination involves two basic considerations that are often overlooked. The first is that all education, consciously or unconsciously, is carried on in accordance with some frame of reference or social philosophy. The second is that all education involves moulding of the individual. Education seeks to change the individual, to modify his behavior in important respects. Merely to send the child to a school where he is surrounded by a particular and planned environment is to influence his growth and development. A purpose is inherent in this process. It seems obvious, too, that this purpose or frame of reference operates with respect to both purpose and method. We have seen how method and purpose, means and ends, are linked together in human affairs, how one conditions the other. Both as respects method and purpose the type of education required by a democracy differs from that required by an authoritarian state. Indoctrination, in the undesirable sense of that term, is avoided when the whole process is lifted to the level of consciousness and understanding on the part of the teacher and increasingly on the part of the learner.

The aim must be to make the individual intellectually a free man. To that end all important angles of controversial problems must be studied. Arguments for and against democracy, socialism, communism, fascism, capitalism must be examined. The meaning of democracy

must be studied and conditions and proposals evaluated in terms of the democratic ideal. A conscious and deliberate building in the individual of the understandings and loyalties that democracy requires of him is not and cannot be inconsistent with these principles and purposes. Any attempt to "put over" on him ideas and beliefs, to withhold salient information, to prevent his exploration of important problems is of itself a violation of the basic principles of democracy. For only the informed individual is a fit citizen for a democracy.

Indoctrination or, better, propaganda has come to mean distortion, withholding of information, evasion, imposing upon the individual; propaganda often is plain lying. Techniques such as these can have no place in education for democracy. But deliberately and consciously to teach democracy is in no sense either propaganda or indoctrination. For intellectual freedom is an essential of democracy. The teaching of democracy is the great challenge that the critical period of social transition upon which we are now entering makes to the American school. To fail to teach democracy is to fail to free the minds of men. We shall have occasion later to examine this problem further, in a somewhat different setting.

VI

A SOCIAL PROGRAM FOR THE AMERICAN SCHOOI

THERE is every reason to believe that we are on the verge of a far-reaching reconstruction of the curriculums of schools and higher educational institutions in this country. It is imperative that this reconstruction be effected promptly in order that the schools may perform their proper functions in preparing the people for the reconstruction of their economic and social life and institutions.

Only once in our history has American education undergone so fundamental a redirection as that which is now required and seems to be taking place. This earlier reorientation began in the second half of the eighteenth century in the period of ferment and change that produced the American Revolution, and such men as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were spokesmen for the new education. Prior to that time, such elementary schools as existed were reading and ciphering schools, and the old classical curriculum still obtained in the secondary schools. But the advance in the sciences, the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, the rise of the middle class, with its merchants and entrepreneurs, and the movement toward political democracy were exerting a profound influence on education. Science

had already gained a respectable place in the European universities. As Professor Counts has pointed out, the times demanded a more practical type of education. Benjamin Franklin's plan for the academy established in Philadelphia in 1751 called for study of such practical subjects as the English language and literature, natural science, surveying, bookkeeping, history, and the modern languages. So far as the curriculum is concerned, the history of American education in the century and a half from Franklin's design for his academy to the World War is in large measure the history of the expansion and development of the educational conceptions inherent in that design.

The curriculums of the elementary and secondary schools have since that time been constantly expanded by the addition of new subjects to meet new needs, some practical, some cultural, some social and political. American history, elementary science, music, the fine and manual arts, health and physical education, the beginnings of home economics have taken their place in the elementary school. The greatest expansion has occurred in the secondary school through the addition of the English language and literature, modern languages, science, the social sciences, including much attention to European and American history and government, music, the fine and industrial arts, home economics, health and physical education, and a wide array of vocational and technical subjects ranging all the way from stenography to the mechanical trades. As specialization developed, the older subjects were classified under several separate subject headings, such as science and the social sciences. This expansion by accretion continued until the offerings of the secondary school and of the college became extremely varied, complicated, and top-heavy. The tendency was to organize the new fields

logically after the fashion of the older subjects of the curriculum. Each was broken into a series of units for the purpose of teaching. The principle of prescription, or of required subjects, was combined with that of election, but with the curriculum divided into so many discrete subjects and units it became impossible to offer any student a rounded general education. A movement that had in the beginning brought great vitality to education by the introduction of many useful subjects required by new social and individual needs had now produced a top-heavy and disjointed curriculum that was no longer adequately adjusted to social needs.

The revolt against this atomistic curriculum began fifty years ago in the elementary school with Parker and the Dewey experimental school, and in the colleges after the World War. The revolt began in the high school in the second decade of this century but gained little headway until the twenties because of the resistance to new ideas owing to the persistence of the classical tradition and to domination by the college and college-entrance requirements. In two respects, however, important changes were taking place in the high school. The ferment of the new education was working slowly in the direction of liberalizing the subjects of study by the inclusion of some subject matter more closely related to contemporary life and by the introduction of newer methods of teaching which increasingly emphasized the value of student activity, the study of contemporary problems, and the wider use of laboratories, shops, and libraries. At the same time, the so-called extra-curricular and student-government activities were gaining headway under pressure from students themselves and from teachers who believed these activities offered significant opportunities for individual initiative, co-operation, and self-expression. Of course these activities

have never been in reality extracurricular but have provided educational experiences denied by the formal curriculum of the school. In the last two decades, significant experiments have been initiated in some of the more progressive high schools, but most secondary schools still labor under a top-heavy "department store" curriculum. Methods are still formal, and the school does not come to grips adequately with the critical social problems of the times. But the pressure for redirection, reorganization, and simplification is becoming very great. The dam may break and the flood descend at any time.

Dissatisfaction with the social content and orientation of the now traditional secondary-school curriculum has, in recent years, been rapidly mounting. If youth are to be given understanding of the social trends and critical social problems of this age of uncertainty, the school must make these trends and problems subjects of study. The need for a reorganization and redirection of education, especially at the secondary and higher levels, comparable to that initiated in the latter part of the eighteenth century, is imperative, and for a similar reason. A new social configuration demands a new education. If democracy is to be served, there is no time to lose.

General and Vocational Education

The problem of secondary and collegiate education today is for three reasons essentially a problem of general education. In an age of tension and transition, it is highly essential that *all* the people come under the influence of such a program of education for democracy as has been sketched in the preceding chapter. This need imposes heavy general-education responsibilities not only on the elementary school but on the

high school and college as well. The complexity of the contemporary scene demands an extension of the period of common or general education.

Again, the new economic and social conditions are rapidly bringing universal secondary education and a steady increase in attendance at institutions of collegiate and university rank. The economic prosperity of the country for more than a century accounted in large measure for the amazing development of our high schools. The people could afford high schools and could afford to send their children to them. Now youth are no longer required to do the work of the country, with the result that the age of entering upon employment is being gradually advanced. Indeed, one of the most serious problems that confronts the country today is the youth problem, which is in large measure the problem of finding remunerative and worth-while employment for eager young men and women. This condition has operated to produce a steady increase in high-school enrollment even during the depression years. The enrollment in the elementary school is now declining everywhere, because of the falling birth rate, but the secondary-school enrollment is still increasing and will continue to increase until, within a few years, all youth to the age of eighteen or twenty are in some kind of school.

Finally, changes in industrial processes are necessitating a different type of education for work. For many of the automatic machine processes little specific technical preparation is essential, and this little can often best be provided on the job or in a factory school. What industry requires is, rather, general intelligence and adaptability. A rapidly advancing technology produces constant changes in the skilled and semitechnical occupations, doing away with the old occupations and bringing in new ones. The best preparation for entrance

into these vocations is a good general education, with special attention to science and the mechanical arts or to the applied social sciences, as the case may be. The operation of these conditions is pushing vocational education into the upper years of the secondary school, or the junior college. It is evident that the junior college should provide for many youth terminal vocational and technical education for the semitechnical occupations. But the element of general education in all these courses should be large. Thus the requirements of vocational and technical education are enhancing the importance of general education.

These profound changes are operating to extend the American common-school program to include the two years above the senior high school to provide a junior-college education for some and vocational or technical education for others. The junior-college movement is growing rapidly, especially in the western states. The optimum organization for the public schools, so far as school units are concerned, may be the one worked out in Pasadena and other places, which calls for an elementary school for children from three or four to twelve and a four-year high school followed by a four-year junior college or vocational school. University and professional education would then begin, for many at least, at about the junior year of the American college. But the traditional four-year liberal-arts college will beyond doubt long play an important part in our scheme of education.

The Subject Matter and Activities of Social Education

Contemporary American culture, then, becomes the center of gravity or the locus of general education, for if there is any universal principle available for the

guidance of the educator, it is that the needs and purposes of education are always found in the needs of the society that it serves. We find here the guiding principle for the selection of the subject matter and activities of the curriculum. Education oriented to the cultures of the past will not serve the needs of American democracy in the time of its greatest ordeal, when democracy itself hangs in the balance. Education that stops short of the problems of today, that does not come to grips with these problems will prove a positive menace.

Viewed from this standpoint, subject matter and activities have no intrinsic educational values. Their values are instrumental. One may study mathematics, or read history or the English classics for the sheer joy of it. Capacity for enjoyment of this kind is not an unworthy outcome of education, but an individual who has acquired no other capacities or interests cannot possibly be considered as equipped for participation in the responsibilities and satisfactions of contemporary life. He will not be a very useful citizen. So far as his value to the community is concerned, he may be of little more worth than a devotee of crossword puzzles. It may be noted in passing that even if this older aristocratic and classical conception of the purpose of education is accepted, the experiences, the subject matter, and activities required to develop him serve a purely instrumental purpose. They are of necessity selected with such an end product in view by those planning his education.

There have probably been no greater or more dangerous fallacies in modern education than those inherent in the beliefs that the mastery of certain bodies of subject matter has special value for mental discipline or that familiarity with the ideas advanced by the great minds of the past of itself has a superior disciplinary value in equipping one for living in the present. A curriculum

justified on such a basis will always be loaded with antiquated materials constituting a positive obstacle to education for living in the modern world, both because of their irrelevance and because vital ideas, materials, and activities will thus be crowded out. This conception still has a strong grip on the secondary school and accounts in large measure for its failures in providing youth the education that the times require.

Let it be clearly understood that this is not an argument for or against the exclusion or inclusion of particular subject matter or experiences. It is to say that experiences should be planned and that they should be selected and planned with reference to the educational purposes in view. It is obvious that the study of the history and role of the Supreme Court will better equip American youth to understand the problems of American democracy today than will a detailed study of the Peloponnesian War or of the campaigns of Cromwell. Some knowledge of the English Revolution of the seventeenth century is, however, essential to an adequate understanding of our political system. Or, again, it is much more important to understand the ideas of Dewey than of Thomas Aquinas. A study of St. Thomas may of itself give but little understanding of contemporary problems, for he was concerned with the problems of an earlier age. But the writings of James and Dewey, which are concerned with the problems of the modern world, contain a criticism of ideas held by St. Thomas and also take cognizance of the tremendous intellectual impact of modern science. A list of classics to be studied by youth that stops a half century short of the present or a college conducted like a medieval monastery are educational absurdities. A curriculum for elementary and secondary schools that is not focused directly on our culture, that does not provide experiences that

prepare for living in this culture, *that does not consist primarily of living intelligently in this culture*, is equally an educational absurdity.

It hardly seems necessary to say that this is not to contend that knowledge of the past is of no value in understanding contemporary civilization. Indeed, the present can be understood only in terms of its historical development. Many classics of thought and art deal with problems and values as pertinent to our age as to the age that produced them and are essential to the understanding of our age. The American school has given all too little attention to ideas. It is true, nonetheless, that the guiding principle for planning the experiences to be provided by the school are found in the needs and problems of contemporary life. A curriculum thus planned will have more intellectual substance and challenge than a traditional curriculum, good for another age, can possibly have.

Planning the Program of the School

The establishment of this principle, however, does not give us a plan for the program of the school. The problem of planning is complicated, difficult, and controversial and has been obfuscated rather than clarified by much of the recent discussion.

Historically, the elementary and secondary schools have embodied different philosophies and purposes. The secondary school was designed for the education of the select and favored few destined to position and leadership in society. The elementary or common school was, on the other hand, designed for the education of the common people, of the masses. In European countries the distinction between these schools and their functions has been sharp. In Germany the *Volkschule*

was for the people, the Gymnasium for the more privileged orders. This aristocratic tradition has persisted even to the present time, even in American education. Greater social prestige has attached to teaching in the high school than in the elementary school. It is interesting, too, that this conception of the function of the two schools has been curiously supported lately by certain psychologists who have held that there are sharp breaks in the development or growth of the individual, that the break between pubescence and adolescence is, for example, always sudden and sharply defined. The tools of learning would be acquired in the elementary school; education would begin in the secondary school. This theory no longer has much support among competent psychologists. Growth is now regarded as continuous and unbroken, though the rate may be faster at certain times than at others. It is, however, always interesting to observe how "scientific" support can be adduced for traditional practice. The high school has become as much a school of the people as is the elementary school. The old distinctions are no longer defensible.

Two schools of thought relative to the planning of the curriculum are discernible today. One holds that the traditional subject-matter organization that has been developed in the last two or three centuries is sound and should be continued. Inherent in this view are the conceptions that each body of subject matter has intrinsic educational value and that it should be chronologically or logically arranged for teaching. According to this point of view, the curriculum would be planned in detail in advance, and it has been so planned in the conventional school. Learning becomes largely a *memoriter* process. That such a curriculum cannot, in the nature of the case, be centered squarely and effectively in the

needs of contemporary life seems obvious, though it must be confessed that this point of view has among its ardent defenders many who believe education should be concerned with the problems of contemporary life. This is a bit difficult to understand. It is one of the mysteries of contemporary American education.

The other conception of the way in which educational experiences should be planned is that which has been advanced by some of the proponents of progressive education. This view lays great emphasis on the role of experience and on the importance of process in education. Experience and process are all-important; and contemporary life provides the scene and substance of education. Since the process is so vital, particular experiences and particular bodies of subject matter have seemed not so important so long as the experiences are concerned with real problems of living and are of interest and concern to the learner. The interests of the learner are of vital importance, for learning is much more effective when the learner is interested; indeed it is effective only if it is strongly motivated by his interest. Education should, then, be concerned with the problems of children, youth, or adults, as the case may be, for these are the problems of real life, of social living. Social problems are central in such a program. But according to this view, it is undesirable, indeed impossible, to plan with definiteness the activities either for a given year or for the elementary or the high-school curriculum as a whole. Too much planning in advance is a bad thing, bound to interfere with the educative process. The nature of the process is such that the learners should share in the planning of their own learning activities. It is not surprising, therefore, that in schools operating in accordance with this view children may be kept, unwittingly, too long on one level of experience,

that there may be gaps in their experiences, that some experiences and much knowledge and many of the insights and understandings essential to their education for living in the contemporary world are almost certain to be neglected or omitted entirely for many individuals. Such a policy unavoidably tends in the direction of anarchy, although the validity of much of the theory on which the view under consideration is based is, in the opinion of the writer, beyond question.

These opposed points of view as to planning the curriculum operate simultaneously within most American schools today, adding confusion to confusion. Practice falls usually somewhere between the two views but is confused. What is the way out? Reconciliation of the two views is obviously impossible. But it cannot be too strongly emphasized that planning is inherent in both conceptions. The proponents of the more extreme "progressive" type of education, with all their insistence on freedom and opposition to imposition, are planners. Their choice of method is a plan. What is needed is a frank recognition of the necessity of planning, based on defensible educational principles, that will provide the type of social education that the times require and that will utilize whatever is valid and defensible in the two points of view. It is obvious that neither point of view is longer wholly tenable. New ground must be taken.

Our knowledge of the nature of the individual and of the educative process, of the social situation and of the social and educational needs of American life are, I am confident, sufficient to enable us to plan a fairly effective school. The problem is, of course, complicated and difficult, and our knowledge is not and never can be entirely adequate to the needs. But the essential principles seem fairly clear and have been

at least partially developed in this discussion. An extensive treatment is neither possible nor necessary here, but our purpose requires further consideration of the more basic of these principles.

We must hold clearly in view the fact that education for democracy must be concerned with living in contemporary culture and with the improvement of that culture in accordance with the principles and ideals of democracy. This is the primary guiding principle for the selection of the subject matter and activities of general education and is the controlling factor in determining the methods of education. Methods must be consistent with purposes. The knowledge, skills, and attitudes that come from experience critically examined, from activity on the part of the learner, increasingly self-directed but involving cooperation with others for the common good, are paramount.

The growth or development of the individual is continuous, is without sharp breaks. Special capacities and interests are likely to emerge early. Some interests may lapse; others will arise. It follows that education at all levels should be based not only on one social philosophy but on identical psychological principles. The educational program of the school should, then, be viewed as a whole from the earliest years to the college or the university. Education should be planned to provide those common experiences, understandings, insights, attitudes, appreciations, and social skills essential to the preservation and realization of democracy. Gaps and omissions cannot be tolerated. At the same time, provision for individual differences, for the cultivation of special interests and aptitudes should not be entirely deferred to the high school but should be characteristic of education at all levels. Upon the high school and the junior college, however, must rest the responsi-

bility for providing for the serious development of special aptitudes and for the beginning of specialization.

If education is to be effective, careful attention must be given to the mastery of the intellectual tools and skills essential to effective learning at each level of development. These tools and skills will be most economically mastered in a context of interest and understanding on the part of the learner. It is, however, essential that the individual be not hampered by failure to acquire these tools and skills at the proper time.

Much adult guidance is essential with young children, but the purpose of education in a democracy is constantly to lessen the necessity for this guidance as the learner grows older, to enable him increasingly to direct his own activities, to achieve freedom through self-discipline and direction. There is much that is specious in the doctrines of freedom and of the child-centered school that have had such a wide vogue in recent years. The interests of children can never provide a program of education. This can only be derived from a study of society.

Since all experiences educate, educational planning must take into account the whole life of the child in school, home, and community. Effective education requires the cooperation of parents, educators, and citizens generally. It is of basic importance that teachers who must carry on the educative processes share in all this educational planning.

It seems obvious, then, that education should be consciously planned, for education is always purposive. The revolt against the rigidity and sterility of the old curriculum is understandable. Revolt was necessary. Any plan must provide for the values in what has come to be called progressive education, which means that our plans must be flexible enough to permit the process

of education to go on, must further, not impede, this process. The choice is, however, not a choice between cast-iron prescription and anarchy.

A Functional Curriculum

These principles do not of themselves constitute a plan, least of all *the* plan of education for the American school, but they are, in the opinion of the writer, valid principles for planning. Within the framework of these principles a considerable variety of procedures is, beyond question, both possible and desirable, especially at this particular time, when we are just beginning the task of reconstructing American education in terms of a new social configuration. The growing amount of curriculum experimentation at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, and even in the universities, is very promising. But much more thorough study of the problems involved and much further experimentation is needed before planning can be made most effective.

It will be observed that these principles stem from the same philosophy as does the progressive-education movement and call for the embodiment in the procedures of the school of most of the practices of this movement but reject its tendency toward irresponsibility and even anarchy and its tendency to develop an exaggerated, socially irresponsible individualism. At the same time, the validity of particular bodies of subject matter for particular educational purposes, the necessity of organizing one's knowledge in a given field to make it most effective, and the necessity of aiming directly at the development in youth of desired understandings, loyalties, attitudes, and habits are inherent in these principles.

While no one plan is dictated by these principles, the broad outlines of a curriculum constructed in accordance with them seem to emerge clearly.

1. Such a program would provide a central core of experiences common for all, constituting what is sometimes called a "core curriculum." This may be managed in one broad, integrated field or in two or more closely interrelated and correlated areas. The experimentation with projects and units of work at the elementary level, with integrated courses, such as the culture courses at the Lincoln School devoted to the study of American culture in its historical development and contemporary manifestations, accomplishments, trends, stresses, strains, and needs, the experimentation with the contemporary-civilization course at Columbia College, the man-and-culture course and, more recently, the four broad field courses in the social sciences, the humanities, the physical sciences, and the biological sciences in the undergraduate college of the University of Chicago—these and many other experiments have contributed to the development of this conception of the value of a central core that will extend from the kindergarten through the college and will be concerned with our culture and its needs and with living in this culture.

In all this experimentation the focus of attention has been our own culture and its problems. The fact that at the secondary and college levels the approach may be historical, more or less chronological, does not of itself vitiate a plan, provided the subject matter and activities selected and the social orientation are always consistent with the principles that we have outlined.

2. Understanding of the present must always include understanding of the way in which the present came about, of the forces that produced it. This obviously is more true of certain aspects of the present than of others. History is more essential for the understanding of the function and operation of the Supreme Court than of the

binomial theorem or of the laws of the physical universe or of the findings of the biological sciences. It is, however, essential that youth gain some conception of the ways in which mathematics and science have influenced the life and thought of man, have created a new world in modern times, and it is especially important that youth understand the conditions that favor scientific progress. This is a value that has been too much neglected, not only in the teaching of the sciences and mathematics but equally in the teaching of the social sciences.

The idea that the past is of little importance in education for living today is as great a fallacy as the notion that education should be oriented to the cultures and ideas of the past and should prize them above the culture and the thought of our own times. The curriculum for the new school will be definitely planned to include study of the past wherever it is essential to understanding the present. The notion that children and youth or adults are not interested in the past when it is related to their own life and problems is one of the new myths in education.

3. In planning this curriculum the old arbitrary and sharp division between elementary and secondary education and between secondary and collegiate education will disappear. There will be no sharp breaks. Cooperation between teachers of the various levels will be essential. Although each level will have its own problems and responsibilities, the differences will be regarded as quantitative rather than qualitative.

4. In the elementary school some provision will need to be made to ensure mastery of certain essential skills, as, for example, reading. In this work every validated scientific technique should be utilized by the teacher. It is extremely doubtful, however, that there is validity in many of the usual practices of the elementary school, as,

for example, formal instruction in arithmetic in the early grades.

5. The high school, at least in the cities, will offer most of the subjects of the present curriculum, but under such a plan subjects will be pursued by those who are genuinely interested in them and have the requisite abilities. Subject teaching will parallel the core curriculum. There is no reason why the ancient languages, for example, should be completely banished. Perhaps more of the modern languages will be offered than at the present time. But youth will no longer be required to study the languages for their alleged superior disciplinary and cultural values. Isolated as we are, for the great majority of American youth the study of foreign languages can have little value. The place of vocational and technical education has already been discussed. The curriculum of the small high school will be liberated from the incubus of outworn ideas—the prescription of subject matter of little interest or value to the majority of its students—and focused on the vital processes and problems of contemporary life. In this connection it must be pointed out that a curriculum for the small high school with adequate choices depends on the creation of larger administrative units and on adequate financing of education in the rural regions, problems that will be considered in the two following chapters.

6. Teaching in every subject-matter area will be redirected. In the arts the student will be concerned with the aesthetic problems of contemporary life. For example, the study of community planning, both material and cultural, will receive the attention that it deserves and will challenge the creative abilities of youth in every medium of expression, in literature, in music, in the graphic, plastic, and industrial arts, in architecture, in design of the home—and in many other ways. Youth will

become students and critics of the contemporary arts and literature. Historical perspective will again be essential. Physical education, home economics, science, the social studies, speech, and the dramatic arts, all will be affected. All need reconstruction and redirection.

7. Upon this school and the education it will afford children and youth will be built a varied program of adult education. This program will provide opportunities for continued vocational and technical education, or reeducation, opportunity for the cultivation of scholarly, artistic, or leisure interests, and, above all, opportunity for the study and discussion of economic, political, and social problems. In a society characterized by rapid change and transition opportunities for adult education are of supreme importance.

8. The school should not and cannot be a thing apart from the community if it is to serve its rightful purpose. Our plan must, then, provide for the fullest possible participation of children and youth in community life. The school itself partakes of the nature of a community. The children should manage the life of the school in so far as possible, and increasingly as they mature. Nothing should be done for youth in or out of school that they can do for themselves. This does not minimize the function of the teacher as a guide. Rather, under such a system, it is increased.

It is unfortunate that our society makes so small a provision for the participation of youth in community life and in socially useful work. Since children must be protected from exploitation, child-labor legislation is essential in the kind of society in which we now live. But children should not be denied the joy and educative experience of actual participation in work and in community activities. Though limited, there are still numerous opportunities for such activities. Professor Paul

Hanna has reported in a little book entitled *Youth Serves the Community*[1] a number of instances of such socially useful participation by youth in civic activities.

The community and its problems must furnish much of the subject matter for study in the school. Such problems as the relations of labor and capital, housing, unemployment are all community problems. For the community is not only the locality but the state, the nation, and the world.

9. All these principles apply to education at the college level. The university also must operate in this same social frame of reference, but this discussion is concerned primarily with the schools.

Discipline and Culture

Intellectual discipline and the acquisition of an intellectual orientation and outlook must be one of the important purposes of this general education. Some knowledge of the scientific method, the ability to assemble pertinent data, to scrutinize it carefully, to make the inferences and *only* the inferences that the data warrant, the ability to see relationships, the ability to look, and the habit of looking, beneath the surface of things should be acquired by every individual. It is highly essential that youth become aware of the necessity of subjecting all their beliefs, too often mere folklore, to critical examination. All this is imperative in a world in which propaganda plays so important a role as it has come to play in the modern world. If American education could do no more than make youth aware of the propaganda that beats upon them and give them ability to spot it, it would more than justify all that it costs. The mastery of the discipline and methodology of a given intellectual field,

[1] Paul R. Hanna, *Youth Serves the Community*, D. Appleton-Century, 1936.

as of the physical sciences, of politics, or of philosophy, belongs in the university rather than in the school or even in college.

Again, it must be emphasized that no aspect of culture should be neglected. Culture will be interpreted neither so broadly as to be meaningless, nor in any narrow intellectual or artistic sense. All that really enriches personal and social living must be the concern of the school. It cannot be too often emphasized that the enrichment of life *now* is essential to the building of the culture that we desire for the America of the future.

Scholarship of the Teacher

Such a program of education will require more, not less, of scholarship on the part of the American teacher. To insist that education should be concerned with knowledge that is functional makes knowledge not less, but more, important. Such an integrated, socially oriented, active type of education can be carried out only by teachers who are scholars in their respective fields. This program will require critical and creative scholarship at every point. It will require thoroughly equipped teachers in every intellectual area involved, in the social sciences, humanities, mathematics, in the arts, in physical education, in home economics, in all the vocational and technical fields.

But the scholarship of teachers must include more than proficiency in their respective fields of teaching. The teacher must also be a student of theories of education, of American society in its world setting and of the social relationships and responsibilities of education. There can be no more important and challenging study. The educational system will require the services of many highly trained professional workers—psychologists, doctors of medicine, social workers, specialists in research,

and many other technicians, all of whom must be scholars in their respective fields. Each must see his work in its larger relationship to the total educational and social process.

Popular education has become one of the major intellectual and social undertakings of modern times.

VII

CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION

One does not have to look far to find ample authority for the statement that American democracy faces few problems so critical as the control and administration of education. Of all the agencies of culture and communication that the modern world has brought into existence, the public school is the most potent for moulding the minds of the people. The administration of popular education is, therefore, a complex problem involving every critical social, moral, economic, and political issue of the times. It is not too much to say that the fate of our free institutions hangs on the answer to the question of who shall control the schools and how they are to be administered.

If education is to serve its rightful purpose, control must be vested in the entire people. Schools that are controlled by a particular group in society, whether political or religious, or by a social class will be bent to the purposes of that group or class. Whenever the interests of such a class or group run counter to the interests of the larger social whole, the schools will be made the tool of these special interests, and will be employed against the real public interest. American democracy permits the operation, under the law, of private and parochial schools that are only indirectly subject to public control. But this privilege, desirable though it

may be under existing conditions, does not vitiate the principle that the final control of education should be lodged with the entire people. Democracy's schools should, likewise, be administered in accordance with the principles and purposes of democracy. Autocratic methods cannot be employed to achieve democratic purposes. American education today is too much under the influence of one social class, and there is too much of the autocratic in its administration.

There can, of course, never be any assurance that the majority will not be led away from the methods and purposes of democracy. The danger of the majority's becoming tyrannical is one of the great risks of democracy that calls for education and constant vigilance. It is also true that a minority may have the interest of the whole people at heart. Our civil liberties open the way through freedom of press, assembly, and speech for criticism of all policies and proposals and for a minority to become a lawful majority. The role of education in the maintenance of this open road of intellectual and political liberty is crucial. If the schools are long controlled by special interests, these interests will, in the end, make education in their own image.

The Unique Function of Education in a Democracy

Because of its unique function, the control of education has been set apart from the other processes of government in the United States. This practice, although the product rather of circumstances than of design, recognizes that either a majority or a minority may be temporarily tyrannical and destructive of the true purposes of education. This policy assumes that education in a democracy, in the short run at least, should be placed beyond and above partisan political control, that the

contribution of education to culture and to the highest social purposes and ideals is so fundamental and so precious that it must be accorded the maximum of freedom and stability. Schools and teachers are, in a peculiar sense, the custodians of those great intellectual and humanitarian values that are the heritage of the entire race, that transcend national boundaries, and that are being blotted out in the authoritarian countries today. In and beyond the enrichment and transmission of this priceless heritage, education has a peculiar creative contribution to make to a liberal society. It is to protect these functions that education has been given so much of political and fiscal independence in this country.

This historic policy does not lessen the responsibility of the school for social and political education but is designed rather to enable the schools the more fearlessly and effectively to discharge these functions. As Charles A. Beard has expressed it,

> . . . When the processes and ends of our democratic society are placed above the exigencies of partisan politics and the immediate advantages of power, then it becomes evident that education as a safeguard and preparation for democratic living must not be subjected every hour and in every way to the unrestrained control of men and women lifted into political office for a brief term by the fortunes of campaigns and elections.
>
> . . . Committed by its historical and immediate obligations to cherishing and advancing the funded wisdom, knowledge, and aspirations of the race, education carries responsibilities which outrun the fortunes of annual, biennial, or quadrennial elections, the ups and downs of parties, the twists and turns of public opinion. . . . It is concerned with all the humane interests which shape society, government, and public policies, and give richness to individual life. The very nature of such obligations and undertakings accords to education in the

United States a special position among the administrative services of government.[1]

Many students of politics and of public finance have insisted in recent years that since education is an activity of government, it should be subjected to the same administrative and budgetary controls as any other branch of government. This argument is plausible, but it overlooks more basic considerations. Education should, of course, be efficiently and economically administered, but it should be kept in mind always that efficiency and economy must be defined in terms of purposes and responsibilities and that economy and parsimony are not synonyms in the parlance of public affairs. The fundamental desideratum is that the schools be kept free if they are to serve their primary purpose of social education. In support of the wisdom of the policy of removing the control of education as far as possible from the struggles of partisan politics, while keeping it directly in control of the people, it is only necessary to cite the power that can be wielded over policy and budgets by financially interested, reactionary social groups or by uninformed and often hysterical popular movements.

It does not follow from this that political parties have no responsibilities with respect to public education. Far from it. It is incumbent on every party that professes interest in the general welfare to support and protect education in accordance with these essential principles of freedom and independence. The members of state legislatures and of the Federal Congress are elected, with rare exceptions, on party tickets. Every year educational legislation becomes more important in the deliberations

[1] *The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy*, by Charles A. Beard, for the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, 1937. This is the best discussion of this problem of which the writer is aware.

of these bodies. As a matter of fact, political parties cannot and will not, in the future, ignore education. But the public interest demands that the schools should not be utilized as an agency of party propaganda or for patronage purposes, that they should be kept out of the hands of corrupt political machines like the Thompson machine in Chicago, the Hague machine in Jersey City, or Tammany in New York City, and their counterparts in smaller communities.

Local and Lay Control of Education in the United States

In two respects educational policy in the United States is sharply differentiated from educational policy in European countries—by the single educational ladder and by the extent of local and lay control of the schools. The ideal has been to provide equal educational opportunity for all. The schools have, at the same time, been to a remarkable degree directly controlled by the citizens of the locality.

The structure of the educational system and its decentralized control can be understood only in the light of its historical evolution. The colonies recognized the importance of education and enacted legislation providing for the establishment of schools, but when the Federal Constitution was drafted, mention of the subject of education was omitted, and control of education was thus reserved to the states. The records of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention would seem to indicate that many of its members believed that the general-welfare clause gave ample power to Congress to participate in the promotion and support of educational institutions. It is known that the matter was discussed. Many of the leading statesmen of the period held that popular education was essential to the welfare of the

republic. It is a fact, nevertheless, that the *control* of schools was left to the individual states, in sharp distinction to the highly centralized control in most European countries.

Schools were first organized in the isolated frontier settlements as a function of local government. Colonial and, later, state laws prescribed the manner in which these schools should be controlled and supported. In time special school committees or boards of education, chosen by the people, were organized under state laws for the control of public schools. Support was, in the beginning, entirely by local taxation. In time, as the system expanded, school administrators drawn from the ranks of the teachers became a necessity. In time state departments of education were established and given control over many matters. State-supported colleges, universities, and professional schools were established. Grants of land were made by the Federal government for the support of schools in the newer states, and especially in recent years state taxes have been levied for the support of the common schools.

But the system of local control has continued down to the present time. This explains the persistence of small administrative units and other practices long beyond the period of their usefulness. There are still more than 125,000 school districts in this country. It is now generally recognized that only by the consolidation of one-room school districts into larger administrative units can well-rounded educational programs be offered in rural communities. The process of consolidation has proceeded slowly, partly on account of the failure of the advocates of consolidation to understand the history and the deep-seated prejudices that lie back of this system—through failure of the educator to understand the American and particularly the rural mind.

Local control, when modified to meet changed conditions, has values of the greatest significance in the present troubled period of our history. By keeping the schools close to the people, the interest of the people in education is greatly enhanced. It is, of course, erroneous to conclude that local control is the only system consistent with the principle of democracy. The control of tax-supported education in England, France, and the British dominions is much more highly centralized but is also fairly democratic. In England local control with reference to certain matters is combined with national control with respect to others. Our system of state and local control still seems peculiarly adapted to a country of such vast size and to the political genius and traditions of our people. Of peculiar importance in our time, it will always be much more difficult to regiment a system controlled locally than one controlled from the national capital.

The New Economic and Political Configuration

But this system of local control has developed deficiencies that need to be corrected. The conditions that originally produced this structure have long since given way to a new economic, political, and social configuration. This new configuration demands at many points far-reaching modifications in the control, administration, and support of education, some of which are already well under way.

The old frontier has vanished. Except on the vast plains of some of the Western states and in some of the mountainous and forest regions, the isolation of the early frontier is not known today to any family or community, and these exceptions must always be treated as special cases. The entire country has been settled, knit together by modern agencies of communication and transporta-

tion. Old political units are, in many instances, becoming obsolete. The county was suited in size to the means of transportation of pioneer times, when a trip to the county seat, now a matter of a few minutes, was a day's journey or more. A movement is now under way in a number of states for the consolidation of small counties into larger and more economical administrative units. These changed conditions also make larger administrative units for the schools practicable. A one-room school can never provide an adequate program for education. Only through larger units, which should conform to natural community lines as well as to political boundaries, can good schools for all be provided. This principle of consolidation will strengthen, not weaken, the principle of local control.

The Social Control of Education

A clear distinction should always be made between the legal machinery of government, or for the control of education, and the forces that actually control. It is very well to talk about a government of laws and not of men, but control is always exercised by human beings. This control may be exerted through regularly constituted legal channels, or it may take the form of pressure, overt or otherwise, on public officials, teachers, administrators, or boards of education, as the case may be.

Actual control of education, as of government, will always be exercised by the dominant social forces or groups in society, and this is no less true in the United States than in other countries. We have sought to remove the control of public schools as far as possible from the capriciousness of the moment and from the operation of selfish interests, keeping this control thoroughly democratic at the same time, but in the last analysis education will be controlled by the same forces that control the other political and social functions and that set the

patterns of culture. Many of these influences are inherent in the long history of a community or a culture and are deep-seated and subtle in their operation. Cultural differences between sections and communities in the United States affect all social institutions. The New England mind and outlook, for example, has differed traditionally in important respects from the mentality of the southern part of the country with regard to many social problems. These differences are reflected in education. But it is with the more overt and potent forces and trends in American life that we are primarily concerned here.

At this point it is necessary to revert to our earlier analysis of the structure and dynamics of American society and of the nature of the social crisis upon which we are entering. Policy in the United States, whether economic, political, or social, eventuates from the struggle of interest groups. Our government has been described as "government by pressure groups." Organized groups, of almost infinite variety, in a democracy such as ours seek to mould economic, political, and social policy. The concern of these interest groups with education has rapidly increased in the last thirty years. Miss Bessie Pierce[1] found over two hundred national organizations representing important economic or political interests striving to influence education to the extent of having made official pronouncements on the subject. Most of these exert overt and often powerful pressures of one kind or another. And most of them are operating in highly controversial social areas.

It is in the economic and political areas that the greatest tensions exist today, and, as we have seen, economic and political problems have their far-reaching social and educational ramifications and implications. How

[1] Bessie L. Pierce, *Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth*, Scribner's, 1933.

much of the national income shall be expended on education? Shall controversial economic, political, and social problems be studied in the schools? From what point of view shall these problems be studied? What methods of teaching employed? The democratic or authoritarian? Shall youth be *told* what the truth is in these areas or be encouraged to make objective and critical studies of problems in the light of the democratic ideals? How shall the schools be administered? Who shall serve on the school board? What part shall teachers have in the formulation of policy? The groups that are working to prevent or to bring about changes in American life in these areas are intensely concerned that the influence of education in moulding the minds of the younger generation, and of adults, should be on their side. And so organized labor, chambers of commerce, associations of manufacturers and of bankers, bar associations, organized farmers, the American Legion, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and many other patriotic societies, religious and racial groups bring pressures to bear to influence educational policy. And so do peace societies and groups promoting moral reforms of one kind or another. And so do organized educational groups —local and state teachers' organizations, the American Federation of Teachers, the Progressive Education Association, the National Education Association, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, and many others.

The class structure of American society, clearly manifest in the operation of these groups, is of the greatest significance both for politics and education. Such organizations as the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Bar Association, and their local counterparts represent the upper class, and, in the main, speak for the *status quo*, for the interests of property. There are, of

course, numerous individuals in these groups who have a much broader view of social needs, who are really devoted to the *public* interest, a fact of great significance. Organizations of labor and of farmers speak for large sections of the middle class. The membership of various hereditary and other patriotic societies is drawn mostly from the great middle class, but an analysis of their pronouncements and policies will show that more often than otherwise these societies actively oppose desirable social changes, regrettable as this may be. Some of these "patriotic" societies have actively sponsored loyalty oaths for teachers and other legislation designed to control teaching.

Many educators shrink from such a frank recognition of the fact and significance of the operation of pressure groups and social classes in this country. But the fact of economic stratification has been demonstrated beyond question of doubt and is plain to be seen by any one who is not blind to the configuration of the society in which he lives. The vast majority of those who do the actual work of the country own no productive property, are without security, and are relatively inarticulate. The great body of manual and white-collar workers are still beyond the boundaries of labor unions and are unorganized. To recognize the fact of class is not to advocate class war or to preach class antagonism. But understanding of the structure and dynamics of American society is absolutely essential if we are to proceed intelligently in the development of social and educational policies. It would seem perfectly obvious that a cultural and economic map of American society is essential to understanding the problems of education and of its control and administration and to the formulation of any defensible social program for the American school. Without such a map it will be impossible to locate deficiencies or to

understand the resources available for the support of defensible policies.

This is especially true in an era of profound social change and transition, in which the very continuance of democracy is at stake. In such a period the schools should not and cannot look to any single authority or organized group in society for guidance as to policy, least of all to those that are most vocal or that enjoy the greatest prestige and wield the greatest influence. For there is, by definition, as yet no consensus in the most controversial areas. An inconsequential minority may represent the best interests of the community. Moreover, in a democracy no area is ever closed to discussion, for a consensus of today may be modified tomorrow as a result of changed conditions, of the operation of pressure groups, or of new and pertinent information. The people, all the people, are, or should be, the final arbiters of policy in a democracy. But the mandate of the people is never clear in controversial matters. Upon educators, then, rests a responsibility for leadership that cannot be evaded. If educational administrators and teachers are to discharge their responsibility intelligently, they must understand the structure and dynamics of American society. For the problem of educational administration is, first of all, a problem of social and political leadership.

It is confusing and misleading to think of the existence of interest groups and classes as morally bad. These are rather social facts, phenomena to be understood. The operation of pressure groups can be judged only from some point of view, and this should be from the point of view of democracy. Judged from this point of view, some are undesirable, others are working for the common good. In few instances is a particular group either wholly good or wholly bad. In any event, it mut be clear that education cannot go it alone. It is too deeply en-

meshed in the purposes and the conflicts of American life. Educators must look for support to those individuals and groups that are working for the realization of democracy. Above all, the inarticulate masses must be informed and sensitized to social conditions and the way in which they are affected by them and to the value of education and the needs of the school. This is one of the major tasks of educational leadership. Only in the hands of an informed public can the interests of education be safe. Here is the most important latent source of support for education.

The problems of educational leadership are complicated and difficult in such a milieu but by no means hopeless. The proponents of genuine democracy have resources at their disposal. The ideals and habits of democracy are deeply ingrained in the people. Americans have great faith in education. Of course, every cause and every interest makes their appeal to democratic ideals, and if fascism ever comes here, it will come in the garb of Americanism and democracy. The question is whether our history and traditions will be employed in the interests of the people or against them. The answer to that question will be determined to a considerable extent by the courage and quality of our educational leadership. There is no good and valid reason inherent in the situation within our own country why educational leadership should fail. But if it is to succeed, it must go to the people, all the people. For in the people is the only power that can subdue the power wielded by inertia and by the intrenched special interests in our society.

Educational Administration for a Democracy

This brings us now specifically to certain crucial problems of educational administration involving boards of education, administrators, and teachers.

The instrumentalities and processes of educational administration developed in the United States in response to social conditions and needs, without much conscious planning. Age-old traditions and practices, some desirable and some undesirable, tend to persist.

For example, the old conceptions of school discipline have continued almost to the present time. Although outmoded by newer conceptions, old practices persist in some schools. Again, although in this country the university has acquired a board of trustees and a permanent administrative staff, some elements of the medieval tradition, under which the university was governed by its faculty, have, fortunately, persisted. The faculties of universities still exercise more control over policy than do teachers in the schools. The administration of schools has been even more influenced by the practices of corporate business than has administration of higher institutions of learning. Many procedures have been taken over almost bodily from business. This was natural and in some instances good, but the time has now come for a critical evaluation of the processes of control and administration and for the development of procedures and techniques essential to the democratic purposes of education. For the administration of American schools and colleges has in many respects been undemocratic and in some instances autocratic and even authoritarian in character. It is not possible to treat here with anything approaching thoroughness or adequacy the many problems involved in a theory and practice of administration appropriate to our social needs and purposes today. But certain problems and principles are crucial and require our attention.

Principles of Administration. An adequate theory of administration of education must take account of all the problems both of education and of administration.

Every procedure should accord with the aims of the schools. But these procedures should also accord with the principles of efficient administration. Just as surely as there are principles of education, there are also principles of good administration that may not, with impunity, be ignored nor violated. Many a school, college, and university administrator is a bungler for no other reason than that he has no conception of the processes of social leadership or of the requirements of administrative efficiency, for the two must be combined at every step. Many administrators have little conception of the necessity or the technique of delegating responsibility or of reposing confidence and authority in others. There is too little understanding of the two functions of policy making and of administration. Many teachers entertain bizarre and impractical notions of the meaning of democracy in administration.

Administration must be efficient, but efficiency can be defined only in terms of the objectives sought. The smooth-running schools cannot be the controlling purpose of administration, for administration is not an end within itself, but an instrument. But the requirements of efficiency cannot for long be ignored. The problems of efficiency are manifold and include financial support, the handling of funds, the planning, erection, equipment, and maintenance of buildings, the internal organization, program, methods, and life of the school, and teaching. Every aspect of teaching is involved. The public should not, and if it understands, will not tolerate an inefficient and wasteful school. Unfortunately, the smooth-running school often gives a false appearance of efficiency at the same time that it is failing miserably as a school for democracy. Unfortunately, too, the public is too prone to indifference to its own interests and is likely to mistake appearances for realities in a technical field.

The problems of educational administration interlock with general social and governmental policy at numerous points. The maintenance of freedom of teaching is at bottom a political problem. The financial support of education involves practically all the problems of taxation in state and nation. The sheer complexity of the educative process and the magnitude of the educational enterprise enhances the importance of the problem of administration, both in its theoretical and practical aspects. Its theoretical problems involve education, economics, and politics. Educational administration, in the planning of buildings, for example, draws upon fields as diverse as those of engineering, accounting, and aesthetics, and community planning. But the educational administrator should be, first of all, an educator.

Boards of Control. The school committee, or board of education, or the college or university board of trustees, occupies a strategic position in the American system of education. Their powers to influence educational policy through control over budgets, buildings, equipment, and, more important, over personnel and curriculums, are very large and are likely to continue so for a long time to come.

It would be difficult to overestimate the value of the contribution to our social life made in the past century by the host of men and women who served as members of boards of education. The record is one of unusual devotion to the highest interests of their communities. But this record has unfortunately too often been marred by men of limited social vision or of low civic morality. Studies have shown that only in the rural districts is the membership of boards truly representative of the people. In urban communities the membership is drawn almost entirely from the more favored classes economically, from the ranks of business and professional men, and

industrialists, including on the average one woman on each board, also drawn from the same class. Organized labor has had but scant representation, the great inarticulate mass of workers none at all. In a period of social or economic crisis the social and educational outlook of members of boards of control for both schools and higher institutions is of critical importance. These boards should represent the interests and aspirations of the entire people and not merely of a group or class. The business or professional man or woman makes a good member if genuinely democratic in educational and social outlook and social sympathies. Otherwise, he cannot be trusted in a crisis or when the interests of his class are at stake, for his deepest prejudices will then betray him and the public interest. It is highly desirable that labor and the intellectual classes should have a larger representation on these boards.

The self-perpetuating boards of trustees of private schools, colleges, and universities, drawn as they are so largely from one class in society, constitute a special problem. Most of these boards have supported intelligently and often courageously the great traditions of intellectual freedom and of democracy, but there have been too many instances of interference with teaching either by direct or indirect pressure. The interests of democracy require that these boards be more representative of the people. The time may well come when it will be necessary for the public to intervene through appropriate legislation for the modification of the charters of these institutions to ensure more representative boards of control and to confer greater autonomy on faculties within the limits of broad public policy. The public should not hesitate to take steps—by law, where necessary—to guarantee freedom of inquiry and teaching in every school, college, and university where youth are educated.

The mind of youth must not be shackled by any hierarchy, social, economic, political, or religious. The public has as deep concern in the education of youth in Lawrenceville, or Groton, in Harvard, Columbia, or Notre Dame as in any other institution.

The function of the board is to represent the public in the administration of education. It has become customary to say that it is the function of the board to determine policy, but this is a misleading doctrine. Certainly the function of the board is not administrative. Interference by a board in the actual process of administration is certain to be disastrous. It is the responsibility of the board, however, to see to it that the schools are administered efficiently in accordance with the law and the best interests of the community. The board should be concerned primarily with policy, but if the interests of education are to be best served, it must share with the chief executive and his professional associates and with the community the determination of policies. It is essential that the board actively participate in this process and hold, with respect to certain matters at least, a veto power. But the major responsibility for the actual formulation of educational policy must rest in the future with the educational profession.

This does not mean that the responsibilities of the board and the contribution it can make are unimportant. They are, on the contrary, of supreme importance. The opportunities for social and educational leadership afforded by membership on boards of education are unlimited.

The Teacher and Administration. In a democracy all who are concerned with carrying out a policy or who are affected by it should participate in its formulation. The possible exceptions to this dictum are found in those enterprises of a highly technical or scientific nature in

which individuals without professional training must work under direction. But even in such instances provision should be made for the suggestions that the non-technical worker may contribute. At any rate, the worker is concerned with the conditions of his employment. But teaching is a creative process requiring the highest professional equipment and abilities and demanding of the practitioner both culture and scholarship. The teacher must be free to exercise his own initiative and judgment. Otherwise, he can never be in any true sense a professional worker. Furthermore, the interests of democracy require that all available sources of knowledge and experience be tapped in the formulation of policies. Out of their study and experience teachers have invaluable contributions to make in the development of policies and programs. Finally, the professional development and growth, the very professional efficiency of the teacher require such participation. It is stultifying to work always under direction. It is responsibility that challenges, that stimulates to thought, that develops powers.

While the two functions of policy making and of administration are distinguishable and separable for the purpose of study, they are in reality inseparable at many points. The functions can be distinguished for the purpose of analysis; but administrators are policy makers, and teachers are administrators. The administrative function is itself in considerable measure a teaching function. The teacher is an administrator charged with the interpretation and execution of policy in the situation in which he works. Every administrative decision has an element of policy making in it. Much always depends on how policies are interpreted and carried out.

Provisions for Teacher Participation. The spirit is more important than the letter of the law in this process of teacher participation, but provisions for the process

are essential. Formal rules and legal provisions should be reduced to a minimum and kept as simple as possible, for the tendency of all such rules is ultimately to bind and obstruct and to develop in the direction of red tape and bureaucracy. In a small school or school system the process can and should be largely informal. But the role of the administrator should never be paternalistic. His role is that of a colleague charged with a special responsibility. In larger school systems teachers' councils will be essential and should be provided for by rule of the board or, if necessary, by law. Such a council will provide a channel through which teachers may make positive suggestions and proposals. It will also provide the administrator with a means for consultation with teachers on many important issues. But a teacher council is not a substitute for the faculty meetings, group conferences, and committee work that has become so characteristic of the American school in recent years. A council can be no substitute for a staff meeting where all members of the professional staff of a school engage in the serious study of professional problems. By the same token a teachers' council in a public-school system dominated by the administration cannot serve its rightful purpose. The administrator should have the right of coming before the council. But if the council is to serve as a medium for the expression of teacher opinion, membership should be restricted to teachers and other members of the professional staff who do not exercise the chief administrative authority.

All questions of educational policy, whether pertaining to curriculums and teaching, organization and administration, buildings and equipment, special services, personnel or public relations should be the concern of teachers. The primary responsibility in many instances will, of course, rest with the administrator, but definite

provision should be made for consultation and advice. It is essential that teachers have the opportunity to examine and criticize recommendations for major changes in policies before these recommendations are finally transmitted to the board of education or to the community. Nor is there any reason why representatives of the teachers should not serve in an advisory capacity in making major administrative appointments. Such consultation is highly essential both in school systems and in colleges and universities and should be regularized.

It should be noted in closing this discussion that it is not contended that teachers have an inherent right to participate in the administration of the school. Teachers have no such inherent right. Teachers and administrators are all public servants, and the ultimate control should and does rest with the public. It is contended rather that teacher participation is essential to the kind of school that democracy requires and, therefore, is in the public interest. The public should insist that the schools embody in all their practices the purposes and methods of democracy. In harmony with this point of view, the thesis that the teaching profession should be accorded a much larger share in the direction of education is being defended in these pages.

Voluntary teachers' organizations, which will be considered in a later chapter, have an important and essential contribution to make in the development of policy both within the schools and in the community. It is of fundamental importance that the teacher be free to affiliate with professional organizations of his own choice.

The Function of Administration

The function of administration, then, is vital and essential and makes definite requirements with respect

to specialized preparation and personality. Proficiency with respect to matters so complex and often so technical comes only with experience. The extreme forms of democracy in educational administration advocated in many quarters today will make for inefficiency and in the end degenerate into anarchy or, worse, into political log-rolling. The town meeting is no solution for this problem. The argument for democracy in administration is not an argument against the responsible executive. The latter is essential to the efficient operation of our system of public education. In an enterprise of such magnitude and complexity there must be a division of labor. An extensive and somewhat specialized preparation is required. The proficiency that comes with years of study and experience should not be discarded. Rotation in office will at most levels probably prove undesirable, as would the filling of responsible administrative posts by popular election by teachers. The interest of the community requires that nominations for these posts be made by administrators and confirmed by the board of education. The function of teachers should be an advisory one with regard to these appointments.

The function and position of the educational administrator is not comparable to that of the employer or the boss in industry. Attempts to draw such a line are pernicious. The administrator does not own the school. Like the teacher, he is a professional worker and a public servant. The administrator is as much a teacher as is the teacher. It cannot be denied that power turns the head of some individuals. There is truth in the famous saying of Lord Acton: "All power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely." Provision should, therefore, be made for removal of the administrator from administrative responsibilities and reassignment to teaching if he becomes inefficient or autocratic and high-handed in his

methods. It is generally believed that administrators tend to become conservative, even reactionary, in their educational and social views. There is much evidence to support this belief, but there are many exceptions to the rule. There is nothing inherent in the work of administration, carried on in accordance with the philosophy outlined here, that need make the administrator a reactionary, and many administrators are far more progressive than are the teachers with whom they work.

Both teachers and administrators are today products of a conception of administration in many respects undemocratic. Almost impossible burdens are today placed by this old system on administrators. Superintendents, principals, deans, college and university presidents are forced to carry an utterly unreasonable load of responsibility. During the depression years many have broken under the strain. These burdens and strains can be lightened only by a more democratic and cooperative type of administration. A more cooperative type of administration, which will strengthen the hands of both teachers and administrators, is, at the same time, essential to democracy.

Administration and Democracy

The history of the last two decades has emphasized the critical nature of the problem of administration in a democracy, and educational administration is only a part of this larger problem. At many points administration has broken down in the democracies. Unless this problem can be solved, democracy will beyond question give way to some form of autocracy. The theoretical and practical problems of making administration efficient and forceful but at the same time sensitive to the public interest are enormous. Reactionary interests find it possible to block necessary measures in legislative halls and

thus cripple the government and render it impotent before its responsibilities. When the President sought to reorganize the executive departments of the Federal government in the interests of efficiency, the cry of dictatorship was raised against him by special interests and demagogues. But when democratic government is unable to act, we shall be threatened with actual autocracy. There is no reason to suppose that these problems are incapable of solution. They must be solved if democracy is to endure. This problem is one aspect of the political crisis that democracy faces. Already graduate schools for the professional education of public administrators are being established. One of the greatest needs of American municipal, state, and Federal government is a genuine civil service headed by professionally trained administrators. This, of course, does not apply to such direct representatives of the people as cabinet members and the principal executives of municipal and state governments.

One of the most hopeful signs of the times has been the steady improvement in educational administration that has been placed on a thoroughly professional basis in most communities in the last generation and is gradually becoming more truly efficient and democratic. The teacher has a much better status both in the school and in the community than ever before. But reconstruction of the administration of American education has only begun. A great creative task remains to be accomplished.

VIII

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

EQUALITY is a basic ideal of democracy. It is also, as we have seen, one of the conditions of the very existence of democracy. The division of men into privileged and underprivileged orders on the basis of social, cultural, or economic advantages is the antithesis of democracy. Equality may exist in political form, but where the disparities between individuals or classes are great or long-continued political institutions will become subservient to the class that wields the most power and enjoys the greatest prestige. It is for this reason that the glaring disparities in the economic conditions of the people that have developed even in this country in the last fifty years constitute so serious a threat to all our ideals and aspirations for the general welfare.

Social and economic equality do not mean identity with respect to either native endowment or contribution to the social welfare. Men obviously differ in their physical and intellectual powers. The ideal of equality has been interpreted in the United States as meaning equality before the law, equality of political rights, and equality of opportunity. Americans have a deep-seated antipathy to conceptions of superiority, to the development of social class distinctions, whether hereditary, as in older societies, or due to wide differences in economic status. A man's worth and his welfare should depend not

on family, not on the enjoyment of economic advantage, but on what he is and on his contribution to the common good. Economic well-being and security for the individual and for the family are the foundations of effective equality.

Equality of Educational Opportunity

The greatest achievements in providing equality of opportunity in the United States have, beyond question, been in the field of public education. In no sphere of activity have we come so close to realizing this ideal. Viewed from one angle, the educational opportunities provided in this country today exceed the fondest hopes of the educational pioneers of a century ago who believed so deeply in popular education and the establishment of free schools open on equal terms to all. These pioneers naturally thought in terms of the common school of their day. It was what we now call elementary education that they sought to make free and even compulsory, but they believed, too, that the state should support secondary schools and institutions of higher learning for those who would and could profit by them.

Equality of educational opportunity demanded, then, the establishment of a school free of tuition open to every child. Within the brief space of a century that ideal has been reached not only for elementary education but for secondary education. Tuition-free schools are available at these levels to all youth, though problems of transportation and living away from home are involved for some youth in attendance on free high schools and though only inferior schools are today available to many. Moreover, most of the states now maintain colleges, universities, and technical and professional schools open to youth on the payment of fees that are either relatively small or less than the fees charged by the best privately supported colleges and universities. The development of this system

of education may well be considered the most notable contribution of this country to democracy, and certainly belief in the desirability and social efficacy of education is one of the salient characteristics of Americans. This system is one of the strongest safeguards of democracy, or will be if it is really made free in every sense of the word—intellectually free, with its opportunities and privileges actually brought within reach of every individual capable of taking advantage of them.

For, contrary to the belief of most Americans, *education is not yet free to all* in this country. In some states the individual or his family must still supply the books and other materials essential to the educative process. Not only are tuition fees a requisite for attendance in publicly supported colleges and universities; many youth are unable to continue their education for lack of economic resources. How can a family on relief work, with an income of fifty dollars a month or less, clothe its children and provide the other essentials of high-school attendance? That it is apparently managed somehow by so many seems almost unbelievable. The facts are, as shown by many studies, that hundreds of thousands of youth quit high school every year for lack of economic resources. The cost to these youth in health, in cultural opportunities available to others of their age, in morale, and the loss to the community are, of course, terrific. Even more serious is the fact that every year hundreds of thousands, perhaps a million or more youth, whose abilities fit them for education at the college or university level, are denied this opportunity largely for lack of financial resources. They have not the funds for fees, for the purchase of books and supplies, and for the expenses of living. From such studies as are available I am convinced that in some states more able youth are thus prevented from entering college than are today attending

college. Lack of resources to continue their education beyond high school is the dilemma that confronts millions of American youth. The assistance now fortunately extended to many on a work basis by the Federal government through the National Youth Administration is utterly inadequate to cope with this situation. Worse, many of these youth are unable to find employment on leaving high school.

The social waste, with its attendant injustice and inequality, inherent in this state of affairs, is enormous and most dangerous. The country is denied the services that millions of its best minds could render to society. Shall the economic status of one's family determine whether he is to have the educational advantages for which he is eminently fitted? Shall one youth be denied a college education or be compelled to work his way through college, often by long, enervating, and ill-remunerated labor, perhaps incurring handicapping debts and physical and emotional disabilities in the meantime, while others less able have ample means for attendance on the best and socially most favored colleges and universities? Such inequality and injustice should no longer be tolerated in America.

So long as present economic conditions continue, the only way in which equality of educational opportunities can be provided is through maintenance grants to youth whose families lack the financial resources to support them in school and college. Merely to provide tuition-free schools is not to provide free education in a society in which, according to the Brookings Institution study of *America's Capacity to Produce*, even in 1929 approximately 70 per cent of the families of the country had incomes of less than $2,500, and 21 per cent had incomes of less than $1,000. According to a recent study by the National Resources Committee, 42 per cent of American

families in 1935–1936 had incomes of less than $1,000, and 14 per cent had incomes of less than $500! Subsistence grants offer for the present the *only* solution of the problems under consideration, though such a solution could be regarded as only temporary. An adequate permanent solution can come only through release of the productive powers of the country and a more equitable distribution of the national income. Genuine equality of educational opportunity can be realized only through some such reconstruction of our economy as has been considered in preceding chapters.

It is obvious, too, that schools and colleges, both public and private, differ widely in quality. These differences are most often due to lack of financial resources. Even by the greatest of sacrifices the state of North Dakota, unaided, cannot provide support for its university comparable to that provided for the Universities of Michigan or California. Many of the states of the union simply have not the resources to provide adequate schools for their people.

The provision of educational opportunity is, then, today first of all a problem of adequate financing of schools and higher institutions of learning and, temporarily, of economic assistance to children and youth of underprivileged families. The foundations of an excellent system of public schools extending from the kindergarten to the university have been laid. This system is not adequate today, but, with resources, could in a reasonable length of time be made adequate. How is the problem of economic support to be solved?

The Expanding School Community

The support of education can no longer remain solely a local concern if an adequate system of schools is to be provided. This is true for two reasons.

The first reason is one of broad social and political policy. The differences in the social conditions and outlook and economic resources of communities are very great. Some value education much more highly than others and are disposed to make much greater sacrifices. In general, urban communities have been more sensitive to the social values of education than have rural communities, and this despite all the sentimentality that has clustered around the "little red schoolhouse." Cultural or social background, traditions and leadership count for much. The system of local control and local support has probably produced at once the best and the poorest schools to be found in any nation of comparable cultural advancement. The good of this system, essential to democracy as we have seen, should be retained. But its weaknesses must be repaired.

Neither the individual state nor the nation can be indifferent to the quality of education or the scope of the educational opportunities provided in the local communities. A chain is never stronger than its weakest link. In a population as mobile as that of this country, the quality of education provided in each community becomes the concern not only of the nation but of every other state and community. The population of great urban and industrial centers has been drawn largely from farm, village, and town. Millions have in the last twenty-five years migrated to great urban centers, particularly to the great industrial centers of the North. The most backward rural regions have supplied a major portion of these migrants. They take with them their social attitudes and habits, their many good qualities along with their deficiencies, which are deficiencies in education.

The second reason is inherent in the economic changes that have come about since the establishment of our free schools. These changes have already been discussed, but

again I must call attention to the mobility of the population, the concentration of wealth in certain states and urban centers and the disparity in the economic ability of the states to support education. So far as financial support is concerned, the school district can no longer be confined to the local community.

The Need for State and Federal Aid

Because of the disparity in the abilities of localities and states to support education, both the state and the nation must participate in the financial support of schools in the future. An added compelling reason is found in the greater convenience of levying the most equitable taxes, such as the income tax, on a state and national basis. Education has been traditionally dependent on the personal-property tax. The injustice and inequalities inherent in this system were brought out in 1938 in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education:

> Frequently real estate values in school districts are entirely out of proportion to the number of children. The larger the number of districts in a given area *and the smaller their average size*, the less likely is there to be any reasonable relationship between wealth and children. In Iowa, for example, the most prosperous district has been estimated to have 275 times the wealth per child of the poorest district. In a number of states, the most able units could provide $100 or more per child for every $1 provided by the least able units.[1]

Similar inequalities have obtained in every state. In Illinois, for example, the property evaluation per child ranges from $880 to $4,373; in the poorest district in a

[1] Report of the Advisory Committee on Education. United States Government Printing Office, 1938. (Italics mine, J. H. N.)

Nebraska county the valuation per child was $2,632; in the richest it was $213,135.[1]

Such inequalities are, of course, intolerable and call for a reorganization and enlargement of small administrative units and for state aid. A number of states have taken definite steps to equalize the opportunities and burdens of education between local districts. Notable among these are New York, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and California. In the early history of the republic, the Federal government turned over to states certain public lands for the support of education in perpetuity. In this fashion many states acquired permanent school funds, the income from which is distributed to the localities. But, with a few exceptions in certain of the sparsely settled western states in which valuable forests or rich mineral deposits were found on these lands, the income from this source is meager in comparison with needs. Unfortunately, these funds were, in many instances, wasted through mismanagement or downright corruption. It is important to note, however, that the principles of state and Federal aid to education go back to the beginning of our national existence.

The traditional method of distributing state aid was on the basis of the number of children of school age, but the principles of need and of equalization of opportunity are the primary considerations in such legislation today. Under the best laws, such as the New York State law, a school that meets a minimum standard is guaranteed for every community. Beyond this minimum, distribution is is accordance with such measures as average daily attendance. Under this plan New York State has distributed over one hundred million dollars annually to local school districts. Some states have as yet taken no steps in this

[1] Frank W. Cyr and others, *Paying for Our Public Schools*, International Textbook Company, 1938.

direction. In most states the provisions are thoroughly inadequate. This situation constitutes a menace to the public welfare and a challenge to educational leadership. However, the possibility of using the instrumentality of state support to cut costs below the level of the most pressing needs is illustrated by the recent history of North Carolina. Under pressure from great corporate interests a program of state support was coupled with legislation limiting the rights of local districts to tax themselves. The laws were designed to make it difficult for the local community to increase the tax rate for schools, even by popular vote, and the amount provided by the state was utterly inadequate. The only protection against such disaster is an informed public opinion.

Extensive and reliable studies show that conservatively the most favored states are six times as able to support education as the least able states. The President's Advisory Committee found that

> . . . about 20 per cent of the children of school age in the United States live in states where with no more than average effort more than $75 per child could be provided for education, while another 20 per cent live in states where not more than $25 per child could be provided without more than average effort. An expenditure of $50 per child would be deemed low in comparison with typical urban standards of any region, yet more than 60 per cent of the children live in states that on a state-wide basis could not provide $50 per child for public schools without more than average effort.[1]

The disparities in the expenditures of the various states on education are startling. New York State expended about $134 per person attending the public schools in 1935–1936, and Nevada, about $128; Mississippi expended $24.55, and Arkansas, $27.60 per child. The states

[1] Advisory Committee on Education, *op. cit.*

with the largest number of children to educate in proportion to the total population have the least resources with which to provide education. Under our economic system these less favored states contribute to the economic welfare of those states in which the title of most of our wealth is held, where the home offices of the large insurance companies and the great corporations that handle the products of these states are located.

There is only one solution to the problem which this situation creates—Federal aid to education. Since the Civil War, the Federal government has assisted the states through grants in aid for technical education in agriculture and the mechanical arts and for vocational education. More recently, under the relief program, funds have been provided for capital outlays and also for the maintenance of certain types of instruction in depressed areas and for student aid. The time has now come when the Federal government must contribute generously to the support of general education or many states will be utterly unable to meet the responsibility that education for democracy lays upon them.

How much of the total budget for education should be supplied by the Federal government, how much by the states, how much by local districts? It is obviously not possible to arrive at a strictly scientific answer to this question because of the fact that a great many problems of policy are involved, but on the basis of available data it should be possible to come to some defensible conclusions. The President's Advisory Committee recommended in 1938 that Congress make a beginning by appropriating a sum of $72,000,000 for all purposes for the first year, to rise to a total of approximately $200,000,000 for the sixth year. This is obviously an inadequate proportion of a school budget that now totals well over two billion dollars and that must be

greatly increased to provide for the educational needs of the country. Measured against needs, such an appropriation would be little more than a pittance. Not all of American youth are in high school. Hundreds of thousands from low-income families are denied education beyond high school. An adequate educational program would require for all its varied services at least a half million professional workers in addition to the present staff of a million teachers. Most teachers are miserably underpaid. Provision for nursery schools, junior colleges, continuation education, and adult education should be greatly extended. Adequate provision should be made for the education of the physically, mentally, and socially handicapped. Most schools are without adequate health services and psychological clinics and other services essential to education today. Recreational facilities, including city playgrounds and camps in the country, should be made available to all children. Subsistence grants must be made available to many if equality of educational opportunity is to be provided—if youth are not to be denied their American birthright.

To accomplish this would, in all likelihood, require an ultimate annual outlay for current expenses of at least four billions instead of two billions of dollars, as at the present time. I venture to propose that roughly one-half of this amount should be supplied by the Federal government, one-fourth by the states, and one-fourth by the local communities. This proposal would call for a Federal expenditure of about two billion dollars. This may seem fantastic to some, but not when the actual needs are faced and not when viewed in the perspective of the growth in educational expenditures in the last seventy-five years or in comparison with expenditures for other services. Nor is it a fantastic expenditure when measured against our vast resources and ability to

produce wealth. As a first step at least a billion dollars should be added to the expenditures for education in the next five years. And most of this increase should be supplied by the Federal government. If education is a national need and a national problem, and it is, why should not the national government assume the major portion of the burden? This seems reasonable, especially when it is considered that the Federal government commands today the most lucrative forms and sources of taxation and that only the Federal government can tap certain sources of revenue. The Federal government is the only tax authority that cannot, in some way, be evaded. The Federal government is spending, in the current budget for roads, armed forces, and relief nearly four billion dollars.

All these are necessary services. But none is more fundamental than education. In this connection it should be emphasized that an increase of one or two billions in the nation's expenditures on education would be a sound economic measure, an addition to family incomes that would mean increased buying power and an increased demand for consumers' goods, to say nothing of all the cultural benefits that will flow from an adequate program of education.

Federal Support without Federal Control

These proposals for increased Federal support for education bring us back to the question of control. It is true that the power that controls the purse strings can control policy. In the end, this may be inevitable in the case of education. Greatly increased Federal support is so essential that it is both imperative and inevitable. Twenty years ago when the National Education Association began to advocate a program of Federal aid for education, this proposal met with determined

opposition, especially among business interests and certain religious groups, on the ground that it would needlessly increase educational expenditures, that education was reserved to the states, and that Federal control would go with Federal support. Some members of the educational profession were apprehensive because of their experience with Federal aid for vocational education under the Smith-Hughes Law. In this instance the law provided for a very undesirable type of detailed control by the Federal board for vocational education. Today the need for Federal aid has become so desperate as to bring about a change in sentiment. Elements formerly opposed have joined in support of the recommendation made by the President's Advisory Committee. But another issue was raised by this report that proposed that a part of the funds be made available, at the discretion of the states, for the support of private and parochial schools. Specifically, it was proposed that a part of these funds might, at the discretion of the states, be employed to provide transportation to parochial and private schools, to provide certain health services, to buy books, and to provide scholarships for students attending these schools. As part of the scholarship aid would certainly be used for the payment of tuition, Federal funds would thus be employed in meeting the operational expenses of such schools. The issues are somewhat complex and to many are confusing.

Let us first consider the question of whether Federal control necessarily goes with Federal support. If it does, then the question is whether the people can control the operations of the Federal government in the field of education in the interest of democracy. The answer to that question is twofold. In the first place, if the people cannot control the Federal government in all its operations, then the game is up for democracy in

this country. If control *is* inevitably associated with financial support, then that issue has got to be faced. In that event it is pertinent to note that the experience of other democracies, notably of France and the British dominions, would indicate that centralized national and provincial control is not, of necessity, inconsistent with the principle of democracy.

But the objections to Federal control in the United States are compelling. Such a policy would run counter to American tradition and to long-established policy under which our system of education has been developed. The people are deeply interested in education, and local control stimulates and gives free play to this interest. Of much greater importance in these troubled times is the undoubted fact that local control is more favorable to freedom of teaching. Under local control those states and districts that desire freedom can maintain it. Education under local control will be difficult to regiment. If control of the curriculum and teaching were lodged in Washington, regimentation would be easier in the event that a fascist-minded political party ever got control of the government. The actions of totalitarian governments should warn us of that danger. Freedom will be easier to defend on thousands of local educational fronts than on one national front. The fact that if the people cannot control the Federal government, all will probably be lost anyway is no answer in the field of education. In the sort of world we live in today, every possible precaution consistent with efficient government should be taken to preserve intellectual freedom. We should take no unnecessary risks. The Federal government is the only power that can cope with many of our basic economic problems, but wherever problems can be solved locally, the danger of centralization and of bureaucracy should be avoided.

But need control go with Federal support? There is no reason why it should. The fact is that every state now has a well-developed, going educational system to which Federal funds may be safely entrusted, with only such safeguards in the way of accounting as are essential to ensure that the funds are expended on education, as intended, and that all citizens, regardless of race, color, or social condition, share equally in the benefits of these funds. The existing school systems are thoroughly competent to expend these moneys. The cause of education will be better served if the states are not hampered by Federal prescriptions. Local control is much more favorable to the experimental and progressive spirit that is essential to democracy. Every argument strongly supports the case for control by the states rather than by the Federal government.

The recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee go too far in the earmarking of funds for specific purposes. Appropriation for specific purposes involves control, for every such specific appropriation involves a decision as to need. Every such appropriation means the shaping of educational programs in the states by the Federal government. The Federal Office of Education can make every essential contribution to leadership through research, through the dissemination of information, and through conferences financed at Federal expense, without the power to make decisions or enforce them.

Federal control need not accompany Federal support of education in the United States.

Public Support Only for Public Schools

Proposals that state and Federal funds be made available for private and parochial schools raise other issues.

It is a sound principle that the public should control the institutions supported by public taxation. Parochial and private schools are controlled by only a part of the public, that is, by religious bodies or by self-perpetuating secular boards of trustees. Once we embark on the policy of public support for private and parochial schools, the logical outcome will be the development of two systems of publicly supported schools, one controlled by the public, one not controlled by the public. The advocates of parochial schools object to the education of their children in public schools because in certain areas of life they want to control the ideas to which these children are exposed. Public schools are not always intellectually free, but the public always has the power to make them free. The teachers in public schools can always appeal directly to the public to create more favorable conditions. It is, then, imperative that there should be no break with the long-established policy that a democracy supports only those educational institutions controlled by the entire people. The fact that there have already been occasional exceptions to this principle is no valid argument against it. The public should consider, too, that any other policy will be wasteful. It is bound to result eventually in needless duplications of facilities at public expense.

Furthermore, public support for parochial education would mean public support for religious education of a sectarian nature. This again would violate one of the basic principles on which our government was founded, the complete separation of church and state.

Finally, the proposal that Federal appropriations for education should be available at the discretion of the states for grants in aid of private and parochial schools of itself violates the principle that the control of education

should be left to the states. The contention that to make Federal funds available for this purpose, if the state desires so to use them, is consistent with state control is entirely misleading. Whenever the Federal government makes funds available for parochial and private schools, it will be exerting terrific pressure on the states so to use these funds and will be placing a powerful weapon in the hands of the advocates of this policy within each state. The Federal government will have entered definitely into the control and direction of education. It will, in effect, have changed our historic policy fundamentally. The principle that only publicly controlled functions should be supported by public funds is as valid for the Federal government as for state and local governments. The Federal government is the government of the people quite as much as are the state governments. These issues should be clearly understood. Public support should be extended only to publicly controlled schools. Any other policy will be fraught with great danger. The experience of France and other countries with respect to this problem should be a warning to Americans.

This is not an argument against private and parochial schools. The Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed the right to maintain private schools. The experimental private school, especially, has a genuine contribution to make to education, provided it is kept thoroughly free intellectually. In parlous times of social conflict private education may actually serve the cause of freedom. But there is no reason why the public should support a system of education that it does not control. There is every reason why it should not.

One System of Public Education

The insistence of the need for increased Federal participation in the support of education is creating another

problem of administration and support that requires consideration at this point. Particularly during the depression years, various Federal agencies have been created in the field of education to meet specific needs. Typical of these are the Civilian Conservation Corps, which has provided work and education for almost a million youth annually since its establishment in 1933, and the National Youth Administration, which has charge of the administration of employment for youth in schools and colleges. Usually under the general supervision of the Office of Education the Federal government has, during the depression years, also made available funds for the erection of school buildings, for the operating expenses of schools in certain depressed regions, and for the maintenance of adult-education programs in many communities. The value of these activities cannot be questioned, although the establishment of them again raises questions of control.

If this trend continues in its present form, it is entirely possible that within a few years we shall have in this country two systems of public education, one controlled by the Federal government and the other controlled by the states and localities; one controlled from the top down and the other more directly by the people in their localities. And this is a situation that needs to be watched very carefully. These new Federal services and the public schools are already ministering in many instances to the same individuals and groups. Friction, inefficiency, and waste can easily develop. If a Federal system of education is allowed to develop, it will tend gradually to weaken the existing public schools. This is another risk we do not need to take. Federal support for these services is essential, but their control and administration, with the possible exception of some aspects of the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps, should be lodged with the

state and local schools. We do not need two systems of public education in the United States.

Control and Support Critical Factors

The conclusion of the argument of these two chapters is, then, that organization, control, administration, and support are among the most critical factors in the development of an effective program of social education at the present time. Antiquated, uninformed, or inappropriate methods of administration will always hamper and defeat education. Boards of education and boards of trustees of colleges and universities should be composed of men and women who not only are not afraid of social change but see in education an instrumentality for making change intelligent. Equality of educational opportunity has not yet been realized, and the schools of the country are by no means adequately financed. Today education must compete for funds with new social services, such as old-age pensions and other forms of social security and relief. The problem of financial support is fundamentally the problem of releasing the productive forces of the country. The basic question is not what proportion of a national income of sixty billion dollars should go to education. Education cannot be adequately supported on so low a national income. Adequate support can be provided only when the national income has been increased to the hundred and twenty or hundred and fifty billions of dollars that our resources and technology have now brought within our reach. But economic reconstruction is in large measure a problem of education. Education is at every point, therefore, inextricably intertwined with our economic, social, political life. Adequate support not only involves problems of taxation and of the distribution of the national income but is dependent upon increasing the national income.

Again, equal educational opportunity is not and cannot be entirely a function of the school but is also a function of the economic and cultural level of the country, of the environment in which children live. The brilliant work of Professor George Stoddard and his associates in the Child Welfare Research Station of the University of Iowa has shown beyond a question of doubt that the intelligence of the child is conditioned by his home, neighborhood, and school environment. These researches have shown that a substantial increase in the intelligence quotient of young children occurs when they are taken from low cultural environment and placed in a good environment and a good school and that the intelligence of children actually declines as their environment and educational opportunities are impoverished.

Robert Lynd, one of the authors of *Middletown*, has pictured vividly the effect of the environment on the individual. He says:

> . . . From the moment of birth, the accidents of cultural status—for instance, whether one is born "north or south of the tracks"—begin to play up and to play down the potentialities of each person. As life progresses, culture writes cumulating differences recklessly into these individual lives; until in adult life two persons of generally similar native endowment will differ so widely that one is on relief, reads the tabloids, and follows Father Coughlin, and the other is a manufacturer, is hostile to expenditures for relief, reads the New York *Herald Tribune*, sends his son to Harvard, and votes for Landon.[1]

The danger resident in these inequalities at this critical time cannot be exaggerated. Those who are favored by existing economic conditions are likely to develop

[1] Robert Lynd, *Knowledge for What?* Princeton University Press, 1939.

mentalities that will be blind to the actualities of social conditions and opposed to necessary changes. Those who are denied opportunity may well become the recruits of some American Hitler.

Education will be crippled and socially ineffective to the extent that these conditions continue.

IX

A SOCIAL PROGRAM FOR THE TEACHING PROFESSION

THE critical and indispensable purposes that popular education serves have made the teaching profession one of the most important functional groups in the modern world. Each of the million teachers of this country is at once a teacher and a citizen, and his civic importance and responsibilities derive in considerable measure from the fact that he *is* a teacher.

The teacher's responsibilities have two distinguishable though related aspects. His work as a teacher in school, university, or adult forums should conform to the severest canons of his craft, for education is education and not mere conditioning or propaganda. Teaching must at all times conform to the democratic conception that the human mind must be intelligent to achieve freedom and must be free to achieve intelligence. To be efficient, teaching must employ all methods and techniques that have been validated by careful research and experimentation carried out in a frame of the most searching study of the problems, purposes, and processes of education for a free society.

The teacher has at the same time civic responsibilities that are inherent in the very nature of this educational undertaking. Schools must be staffed, housed, and

financed. The curriculum and methods of teaching must be planned. The public welfare is vitally affected by these processes at every step and in their every aspect. Upon teachers more than upon any other group of necessity rests the obligation of informing the larger public as to educational needs and of collaborating with the public in its educational program. This leadership in the development of educational policy likewise involves participation by teachers in the development of the basic social, economic, and political policies of the nation.

The Civic Responsibilities of Teachers

That the general public looks increasingly to the educational profession for counsel and leadership in the formulation of educational policies is inherent not only in the nature and magnitude of the educational enterprise but in the nature and dynamics of contemporary American society. It is desirable that public policy always represent shared decisions worked out in a spirit of reasonableness with only the general welfare in mind, but the fact is that policy eventuates from the clash of interest groups. A primary purpose of popular education is the development of a social and political intelligence among the people that will lift political discussion to a higher level and thus contribute to the improvement of the processes of democracy, but this very purpose makes education itself, particularly in a time of strain and uncertainty, a controversial subject. A school that attempts a critical examination of conditions and of the assumptions that underlie the *status quo* will always encounter resistance from some quarter in our society.

It is not necessary again to marshal in detail the evidence in support of this contention. The supporting

facts are obvious. The public is intensely concerned about education. Educational measures are warmly debated in every session of every legislature, and are arousing greater interest in the halls of Congress every year. Every capital has its educational lobby, and, a matter that is generally overlooked, its antieducational lobbies as well. The antieducational lobbies, always protesting their loyalty to education, consistently oppose increases in expenditures for schools and have succeeded in placing on the statute books in the last generation much legislation designed to regulate teaching. In many communities political machines have, from time to time, managed to control the schools and to use them for patronage and other purposes. In most communities the schools are kept well out of the hands of "politicians" and special interests, but, as the history of many communities, large and small, shows, this has been done only at the price of constant vigilance and often only through the best of organization and leadership. Always it is the teachers who must take the initiative in protecting the public's interest in education.

Those who think that teachers can keep out of civic affairs or politics and perform their educational function labor under an illusion. Not only are educational policies themselves social and political in their nature but the process of education is profoundly affected by economic and social conditions. Education does not proceed effectively in a slum district with its bad social environment and bad housing, nor is an empty stomach or a sick body conducive to the educative process. The economic and political causes of such conditions and their removal are, therefore, in a peculiar sense problems for teachers, however much they may be the problems of other civic groups and of all citizens. In the complexities of contemporary society no other group is likely to take

the lead in matters educational, unless its aim be to defeat the true purposes of education. Teachers have, then, collective social responsibilities that are inherent in the fact that they are charged with the important function of education.

Teachers are, moreover, citizens, and as citizens have the right and obligations to participate actively in political life. As a citizen, the teacher must be free to associate himself with the political party of his own choice, to vote his convictions, and, subject to the proper demands of his profession, become, if he so desires, an active advocate of the political measures that he favors. To deny him this right would be to deprive him of the rights of citizenship. Many of these obligations he can effectively discharge only in cooperation with his fellow teachers.

To say that teachers must take the initiative in the development of educational policies does not mean that the larger public, which includes teachers, can or should delegate the control of education entirely to the teaching profession. Teachers should assume educational leadership because they are most competent to do so and also because no other group in society is likely to assume this responsibility—unless perchance teachers become so completely the tools of special interests or so utterly complacent that the public must drastically intervene. Without the active leadership of the profession, education will be neglected, and the school will surely become a tool of reaction.

At the same time, teachers, as citizens and as teachers, cannot avoid participation in shaping the larger social policies of community, state, and nation. The quaint notion that a banker, a manufacturer, a lawyer, a labor leader, or a farmer is more entitled than a teacher to voice his opinion on economic and political matters is a

part of the mythology that has come down to us from the past. This notion would seem amusing were the consequences of it not so serious and so dangerous. The truth of the matter is that organized bankers, industrialists, lawyers, labor, and farmers are battling for their own interests. These interests may or may not be identical with the public interest. Where they are not identical with the interests of all, they should be opposed by all citizens devoted to democracy, including teachers. In any event it is the responsibility of the teachers to speak for the interests of education. It is legitimate and desirable that teachers should be concerned with their own special interests, with matters of salary, tenure and retirement provisions, and proper conditions of work, but only where these are also the interests of education and thus of the public. We often hear it said that teachers should be disinterested. There is considerable truth in this dictum, for teachers can serve the cause of education only as they place the general welfare above their own private interests. The public interest, particularly as it affects and is affected by education, is their interest. And for that matter the profession has so abundantly demonstrated its loyalty to the best interests of society as to make the prescription of loyalty oaths one of the absurdities of our period.

The Necessity for Organization

The teaching profession can discharge its collective social functions only through organization. It is an interesting and significant fact that the first teachers' organizations were formed in this country when the battle for free schools was being fought out and the foundations of public education were being laid. These early organizations, in cooperation with lay groups, did much to win

public approval for the principle of free schools. A number of state teachers' associations and the National Education Association were organized prior to the Civil War. After the war came the rapid expansion of public education that has continued to the present time and likewise a rapid growth and development of teachers' organizations.

The educational, personnel, financial, and administrative problems connected with this expanding system of schools were enormous. Educational leaders found essential some medium for conference and the exchange of ideas and information relative to problems of curriculum, method, organization, and administration. The reports of some of the committees of the national societies in the latter years of the century did much to give American education its form and content. But the membership of these organizations was small until well into this century. The rank and file of teachers was not involved. The membership of the N.E.A. was only ten thousand at the time of the establishment of its headquarters in Washington in 1919 and its reorganization and democratization a year later.

With the turn of the century, as the problems of education became more complex and insistent, educational associations began to enlarge their interests and to assume a new importance. Local associations began to interest themselves with such matters as salaries, tenure, and pensions. State associations, finding it necessary to concern themselves with educational legislation, grew rapidly in membership and influence. In a number of states full-time secretaries were employed and permanent headquarters established. These organizations had reached a high state of development before the beginning of the World War. The American Federation of Teachers was organized and affiliated with the Ameri-

can Federation of Labor in 1916. This was the first teachers' organization with a well-defined social orientation. The Progressive Education Association was established in 1918 and may be considered the first national association with a particular and well-defined educational orientation. Various societies had also been formed in fields of specialization and in the field of higher education, but the purpose of the present discussion will be best served if attention is centered on those comprehensive state and national associations concerned primarily with the problems of the schools. The array of organizations in locality, state, and nation is now almost bewildering.

More and more the organized profession has been drawn into the consideration of problems having far-reaching social and political implications. In 1919 the National Education Association adopted the report of its Committee on the Emergency in Education advocating Federal aid for education, without Federal control, and the creation of a Federal department of education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet. The campaign for Federal aid has been prosecuted vigorously since that time. Teachers' organizations have likewise worked for programs of state support for education, for more adequate salaries, tenure and retirement provisions, and for many other educational measures. They have resisted the enactment of legislation for the control of the curriculum and the prescription of teachers' loyalty oaths, sometimes vigorously, sometimes listlessly, often depending, it would seem, on the immediate importance of other educational legislation pending at the time. On the whole, however, these societies have stood firmly for the principle of freedom of teaching. Today "the educational lobbies" are under attack. As the economic and political crisis has deepened, the tension caused by this crisis has been reflected in all educational associations concerned

with problems of policy and with financial support or with the social aspects of the curriculum.

Functions of Teachers' Organizations

The organized profession is now faced with the question of the relation of education and of the educational profession to the process of economic and social reconstruction. The profession has now come to a fork in the road. Until recent years the soundness of our economic system had not been seriously questioned. Now the very foundations of our economy are being questioned by a large and growing number of citizens. Important political groups are now advocating that the economy be brought under more effective social control. The battle is on between the supporters of *laissez faire* and the advocates of a democratic collectivism such as has been described in earlier chapters. In the meantime, an advancing technology and long-continued depression have created acute problems of unemployment and of relief. Education must now compete with relief and social security for public support. The teaching profession cannot stand by in the position of a neutral observer in this situation. Education and teachers are involved at a thousand points. The profession must come to a clearer understanding of its social responsibilities and functions.

Already this process has begun. Pressure is being exerted in one direction by the American Federation of Teachers and to a certain extent by the Progressive Education Association. The N.E.A. has created a Commission on Educational Policies that is studying the responsibilities of education and of the profession with reference to many social problems. The social problems of education is the chief subject of discussion on the programs of educational meetings. All important teachers' organizations have committees and commissions at work

on various aspects of these problems. Much consideration is now being given to the position of teachers in society and to their individual and collective social responsibilities. What are the social functions of teachers' organizations? If the argument in the preceding pages is valid, the broad outlines of these functions seem very clear. They fall into six broad categories.

1. The study of education is an obvious function and one that becomes increasingly important as its problems become more critical and complex. It is obvious, too, that the discharge of this responsibility involves problems of public relations, for education cannot be carried on in a vacuum. It is incumbent upon the profession to advocate, after study, the type of education that will best serve the present needs of democracy. The fact that it is impossible ever to know with finality the needs of democracy at a given time does not relieve the organized profession of this responsibility.

2. That the teaching profession should assume leadership in the formulation of broad educational policy seems fairly clear even to most of the public, for it is now generally recognized that education has become in many of its aspects a highly technical and professional matter, upon which teachers are most competent to advise, though the activities of teachers in this direction are often bitterly resented in some quarters.

3. That teachers should participate in the shaping of larger social, economic, and political policies is not so clear either to the public or to the profession itself. But the logic of the situation seems to me perfectly clear. Educators cannot be indifferent to the serious economic and social maladjustment existing today, to the maldistribution of the national income, to the forces of depression that all but paralyze our productive powers, to unemployment, to the waste of our natural resources,

to child labor, to housing and health needs, to fascist tendencies that, if allowed to develop, will menace the very existence of democracy, to the all-too-frequent denials of civil liberties, to interference with freedom of teaching, to the problems of foreign relations, to the danger of war, which places in jeopardy civilization itself.

The influence of the million teachers must be made to count on the side of democracy in the solution of these problems. Moreover, every one of these problems is a problem that must be studied in the schools. Every teachers' organization concerned with policy that sidesteps these issues in the future will be evading one of its major responsibilities. This leaves open for the moment the question of how far they should go or how they should proceed. But for teachers in their organized capacity to keep silent, to do nothing, will be a denial of their highest obligations. Already the profession is accepting this responsibility, if often timidly. It is resisting the forces that would suppress freedom of teaching. It is calling the attention of the public to the ways in which economic maladjustments affect children and youth, and education. It has supported the child-labor amendment. It has spoken out, though often confusedly, on the problems of war and of international relations. But most teachers have but inadequate understanding of these problems.

4. A fourth major function of teachers' organizations in this critical period is, then, perfectly clear. It is the social and political education of the members of the profession and of the young people who are coming into the profession.

At this point our educational traditions are in conflict. The responsibility of the school for social education has long been recognized, and the problems of social education have been and are being widely studied. There

is a growing recognition that education is itself a fundamental social process. But it has also been a tradition in this country that the schools should preserve a strict neutrality in matters political and that teachers should keep out of politics. The result is that the great body of the profession is not well informed and is confused as to its social and political relationships. Education is a social process, yes. But the prevailing view has been that education should handle controversial issues very charily or avoid the hottest ones entirely. The result is that education often stops short of being effective. And again let me insist that I am talking about education and not propaganda. Let me insist, too, that the teacher as a teacher and citizen has political responsibilities that arise from the fact that he *is* a teacher. It follows that he must be politically informed. The political education of teachers in the broadest and best sense, but in a very real and practical sense, is, then, one of the most important functions of educational associations today.

5. These organizations have definite responsibilities in the control and administration of education. A local organization of teachers is a proper logical medium for the expression to the public of teacher opinion on local educational problems, an essential factor in the formulation of policy whereby schools are administered democratically. As I have pointed out earlier, the public interest will be well served if greater responsibilities are placed upon the profession for the direction of education. For teachers to take over entirely the control and direction of education would, of course, be as undesirable as it would be impossible.

6. Finally, the protection of freedom of teaching not only is a major function of the organized profession but is its first civic responsibility. If my analysis of the

social scene is valid, the defense of this value in a time of social stress will depend on a politically informed teaching profession that has won the confidence of the public through enlightened cooperation with the constructive social forces in the public.

Collaboration with the Public

The thesis that is being defended here is that those teachers' organizations that are concerned with broad problems of educational policy have acquired a public character and inescapable public obligations. This applies to local organizations concerned with general problems of educational policy, to state teachers' organizations, and to such national organizations as the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the Progressive Education Association, the American Council on Education, the Association of University Professors, and to various associations of college and university administrators. The National Education Association has acquired a public character quite as much as has the National Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, or the American Bar Association.

The discharge of their obligation necessitates cooperation by these societies with the public and with other organized functional groups. As long as educational organizations were only societies for the study of education in its more technical aspects, their public relations were relatively of much less importance than now. Today, their most difficult problems are problems of public policy.

It is, of course, impossible to draw a sharp line between the responsibilities of teachers as members of a school staff and as members of professional organizations with

respect to these public relationships. The modern school works closely with the home and the community. It looks upon the parent-teacher association, for example, as an indispensable agency. The parent-teacher association has, in fact, become all but an integral part of the school itself, for the very process of education, according to the modern concept, is dependent on the closest cooperation between the school and the home and other community agencies. But many of these relationships can be effectively maintained by teachers only in an organized capacity. For example, when a group of civic organizations in a certain city were trying to select citizens for nomination for the school board in a crucial school election, they sought the cooperation of the teachers. The teachers' organizations afforded a proper medium for extending advice and counsel and, later, for cooperation in electing the ticket agreed upon. Such action, on the part of the teachers, through their own organizations, was dignified and in keeping with their professional obligations. The superintendent of schools was relieved of the embarrassment of personal action. The teachers' organizations, in this instance, could speak for the interests of the schools more effectively than could administrators, even though administrators are responsible directly to the community as well as to the board and though as citizens the administrators have a constitutional right to participate personally and directly in these nominations. Such illustrations could be multiplied indefinitely.

The point is that cooperation between teachers' organizations and other groups was essential to the promotion of the best interests of the schools. Such cooperation is even more essential on a state and national basis. This brings us to the consideration of how such cooperation and collaboration can best be carried on.

The Problem of Method

The method of collaboration with the public must be consistent with the purposes of education in a democracy.

Up to a certain point this collaboration offers no particular difficulty. Most citizens believe in public education, though there are wide differences of opinion as to the extent of the educational program that should be provided at public expense. Almost all organized groups concerned with matters of public policy will, within limits, support education. It may well happen that an organization that is working for tax reductions and is, therefore, opposed to increased educational expenditures will support expenditures for specific purposes. The United States Chamber of Commerce has, for example, opposed increased Federal expenditures for education, but local chambers of commerce often favor increasing the local budgets for certain purposes. In some communities chambers of commerce have consistently favored adequate school budgets. Organizations that seek to prevent the study of certain controversial social problems or to secure the enactment of teachers' loyalty oath laws with the plain purpose of controlling teaching often favor a generous support for the kind of schools they believe in. Always there are individuals in such organizations who are intelligently loyal to the best interests of democracy and of the schools and who can be counted upon for support.

The organized profession should heartily cooperate with all individuals and groups whenever they are willing to support progressive educational measures. But unfortunately, there have been and are today many exceptions to this desirable state of affairs. Educational policies are matters of controversy. Adequate budgets are opposed. Reactionary and chauvinistic political

and economic groups oppose freedom of teaching. Political machines seek to control schools for patronage purposes and have too often succeeded.

There is simply no getting away from the fact that the maintenance of public education is at bottom a political problem. The controversy over educational policy is greatly intensified in a time of social and economic tension and change. Education being essential to the preservation of democracy, the friends of education must look to those political groups and forces that are fighting the battles of democracy. If fascism ever seriously threatens in this country—and so long as millions are without that economic security essential to their well-being and to the very existence of democracy, the threat of fascism will be a real danger—the teaching profession will have no choice but definitely to ally itself with those political forces dedicated to the preservation of democracy. A serious threat of fascism will be accompanied by a determined effort to control the schools and to make them serve the purposes of reaction. The public schools are concerned with the welfare of the people. Teachers, if they would be loyal to their highest obligations as teachers and as citizens, must, then, be concerned with the welfare of the masses of the people in the fight against economic and political privilege. There can be no other choice, for the very continuance of education *for* democracy will be at stake. There is no other choice for teachers either as teachers or as citizens.

A recent example of constructive leadership, of bold and imaginative action on the part of a teachers' association may be cited to illustrate the responsibilities that the profession faces in this field of public relations and the nature of some of the problems and issues involved. The state of Colorado was without an adequate program

of state support for schools. A large proportion of the wealth of this state of vast area and a population of about one million is concentrated in Denver, in which about 30 per cent of the population resides, in three or four smaller cities, and in the hands of six or eight large corporations including the railroads and other utilities. An income tax was essential to the solution of the financial difficulties of the commonwealth but was, of course, stoutly opposed by business and industry. The Colorado Education Association, under the able and courageous leadership of its secretary, William B. Mooney, became the spear point of a movement for an amendment to the state consitution authorizing a graduated income tax. The teachers formed a working alliance with farmers' organizations, organized labor, the parent-teacher organizations, and with other progressive civic groups. The amendment was defeated in 1934, but the lines held, with the result that in 1936, in the face of bitter opposition, the amendment carried by a large majority. In the session of the legislature following, a graduated income-tax law was enacted and a large proportion of the proceeds assigned to the schools of the state for the purpose of assisting the local districts in maintaining adequate schools. The income tax also served to reduce the tax load on real and personal property, thus reducing the tax burden on poorer communities and upon all citizens of modest means. But the costs of an old-age-pension measure, also voted in 1936, and of relief were high in Colorado, as in other states. The total educational budget of the state is about twenty-seven million dollars, whereas the cost to the state of the new program of old-age pensions is about eight millions! This is exclusive of the contribution of the Federal government, which is about six millions. Some of the big taxpapers looked with envy on

the proceeds of the income tax and determined to lighten their burdens by an assault on the support of the schools.

Soon after the convening of the state legislature in January, 1939, a new governor, disregarding campaign pledges, made a sudden and dramatic demand that the proceeds of the income tax be diverted to the general funds of the state. He pictured the state as on the verge of bankruptcy. He asserted that these funds were necessary to carry the costs of the old-age pensions and of relief. Every political trick was employed—for one purpose, to force a reduction in the cost of education in order to lessen the tax burden that would otherwise fall on those most able to pay, for it was not the people who were demanding this diversion. That the educational leadership of Colorado displayed the insight and courage that this crisis demanded is shown by the following message to the people and the teachers of the state, which the Colorado Education Association published in space paid for by the Association in the *Rocky Mountain News* of Denver on Jan. 26, 1939:

What the Fight Is About!

The present income tax fight is an attempt to deny in Colorado the principle "that wealth shall be taxed where it is and to whomsoever it belongs to educate children where they are and to whomsoever they belong." This is the principle upon which the support of the American public school system is based. Attempts to deny and defeat this principle have caused the major battles that have been fought in America relative to the support of the public schools. The fights to create the school system in America, more than one hundred years ago, were fought over this principle. The rich and wealthy, fortunately with many notable individual exceptions, were then and are now always found on one side of this battle; the mass of the people, including the moderately-well-to-do, are always found on the other side. The fights have always

been accompanied by name calling and astute attempts to take the minds of the people away from the real issue by "drawing red herrings across the trail."

The present fight in Colorado is true to pattern. It may be a long struggle during which many who ought to fight with the common people will be found, for political, personal, or other reasons, on the side of the rich and well-to-do. In these fights classroom teachers are always urged to turn against the superintendents and other school administration officials and blame them for lack of money to adequately support the schools, just as was recently done in Colorado in a radio address by the present governor of the state. Boards of education in these fights are urged and sometimes forced to "crack down" on their superintendent of schools and teachers who may become too active in the fight on the side of the common people. It has always been a nasty fight because the leaders of this group who deny the principle, that wealth shall be taxed where it is and used to educate children where they are, are ruthless and will use, wherever they think it will be effective, the "crack down" methods with which they have won so many of their battles. Their viewpoint was and is "Why should I be forced to spend my money to educate the other fellow's children?"

The fight is on in Colorado. You may become weary in the fight. You may be personally attacked. But when these things happen to you, remember the sacrifices your predecessors have made in fighting for the same principle, namely, "That wealth shall be taxed where it is and to whomsoever it belongs to educate children where they are and to whomsoever they belong."

Rich and wealthy citizens of Colorado, again, fortunately with many individual exceptions, are now fighting to divert the graduated income tax to the state general fund, thus making it "just another tax." In fighting for this diversion they hope to create popular sentiment against it which would eventually result in the repeal of that tax. The money arising from this tax, under the present law, is being used to support schools throughout the state with a corresponding reduction

in the property tax for that purpose. This use is of especial value to the poorer areas of the state that are unable, because of lack of wealth, to adequately support their schools. These rich and wealthy citizens object to the idea that their money should be used to support schools outside of the district in which they live and are therefore again denying the principle that wealth shall be taxed where it is to educate children where they are.[1]

The reader will observe the clarity with which the issues are drawn in this statement and the fact that class lines and interests were perfectly apparent in the conflict. The teachers made no attempt to ignore this class alignment but, on the contrary, made explicit that this was a contest between the people and privilege. It is true, also, that many wealthy citizens of the state staunchly supported the schools in this crisis. The class alignments, although evident, were not sharp and clear, for the devotion to democracy and to education is deep among all the people. The point is that, in this episode in the old struggle of the people and against privilege, the teachers of the state had no option but to make the real issues clear to the general public. This is only one example, though a rather unusual one, of the public activities of the educational profession in this period. Numerous other examples could be cited. The profession is making its influence felt in political affairs. This situation serves to illustrate another fact of profound importance. The individual states of the union are unable to cope with many of the most basic economic and social problems, such as the problem of social security. These problems can be dealt with only on a national scale.

[1] Colorado Education Association, Statement published in the *Rocky Mountain News*, Denver, Colorado, Jan. 26, 1939.

The Form of Cooperation

This brings us squarely to the question of the form that cooperation with other organized groups shall take. The most critical issue in this field at the present time is that of the desirability of teacher affiliation with organized labor. One organization, the American Federation of Teachers, took this step over twenty years ago.

Assuming that the labor union in question is devoted to the interests of democracy and that it employs the method of democracy both in the conduct of its own affairs and in all its public relations, there can be no question of the constitutional, professional, or moral right of a teacher to belong to it or of an organization of teachers to affiliate with it. This leaves open, however, the question of whether such affiliation is desirable, and that question involves a number of important considerations. Only through organization can the millions of workers who have no share in the ownership of the instruments of production and distribution make their influence effectively felt in our economic and political life. That teachers have a community of interests with organized labor and should cooperate with labor more closely is scarcely debatable.

But a categorial answer cannot be given at the present time to the question of whether teachers should enter the organized labor movement. Decisions must be made in the light of conditions. Conditions vary from state to state, from community to community, and from time to time. The great body of the American people is not labor- or union-minded. The industrial workers constitute barely a third of all the workers of the country and less than half of these are in unions. The number of industrial workers seems actually to decline with the advance of technology. But few of the white-collar and

professional workers are unionized. Union labor will, therefore, perhaps for a long time, continue as a minority group. There is much reason to believe that the political importance of industrial workers has been greatly exaggerated under the influence of Marxian thought. The assumption that the political role of industrial workers will be more important than that of workers in the white-collar occupations or on farms certainly needs to be reexamined, especially in view of the part played by other groups in the last twenty-five years in the revolutionary changes in Italy, Germany, and even in Russia. The middle class is still strong in this country and comprises many elements. There is much reason to believe that the role of the intellectuals, a large group in modern society that includes teachers, may be more critical than that of almost any other element in society. In its insistence that the relation between teacher and administrator is comparable to the relationship between the worker and the boss or between the worker and the owner in industry, the teachers' union has certainly not been on sound ground.[1]

The argument for affiliation must rest upon the fact that organized labor has been and is today, despite much confusion as to purpose and methods and serious divisions, working for a better life for all those who carry on the productive work and services of society. It is working for the improvement of the lot of the common people. Some unions are conservative, even reactionary in outlook. Some are bedeviled by factions that are pursuing objectives and employing tactics that are corrosive and disruptive and that, however desirous of improving economic conditions these factions may be, sow discord where good will and cooperation are needed. But organized labor is today one of the strongest sup-

[1] This problem was considered in Chap. VII.

ports of American democracy and of public education. A strong labor movement is essential if the American people are to cope effectively with the economic and political problems that confront them. Such a labor movement must cooperate with farmers and with other occupational groups and with the liberal political forces of the country. It is for these reasons that I believe a strong case can be made for teacher affiliation with labor. Affiliation will certainly be defensible and may be desirable where teachers can effectively insist that the union in all its purposes and methods conform to the ideals of democracy and to those principles foundational to democratic, professional, and efficient educational administration. For teachers to accept the leadership of organized labor uncritically and subserviently would be as objectionable as subservience to organized business and industry or to any other group. And to me it seems also clear that in many localities and in many situations membership in teachers' unions is not as yet practicable.

At this point I should like to make a distinction that seems to me important. Political cooperation can have many of the advantages of affiliation, with fewer of the disadvantages under present conditions. Obviously, the political situation does not indicate the desirability of teachers' organizations entering a political party now, though, as we have seen, a condition may arise that will leave no other option for those teachers who want to work effectively for the defense of democracy through a fuller realization of its possibilities. Under present conditions teachers should be selective in their support of candidates and of parties. They should make it clear that they will collectively oppose parties and candidates that are not committed to the promotion of the best interests of education and of democracy. Teachers should cooperate with those political groups working for such

broad objectives as an intelligently conceived program of social security, investment by government in housing and similar enterprises, adequate wages-and-hours legislation, the social use of taxation, the provision of real jobs for all at decent wages, adequate extension of essential social services in such fields as health and physical education, the development of agencies for the planning and coordination of our economic life, and for other measures. The collaboration of the teachers of Colorado with labor and farm groups in the enactment of an income-tax measure is an example of the type of deliberate political cooperation that is desirable and often feasible where organic affiliation is not possible.

The Present Situation

Teachers need, then, to clarify their position on the critical issues confronting democracy in the United States at the present time and on the relation of education to the solution of these problems. They must, it seems to me, identify themselves more closely with the forces working for the preservation and realization of democracy. It is pertinent, then, to enquire what are the present attitudes of professional organizations with reference to these problems.

The National Education Association underwent a reorganization in 1920 that made this organization much more democratic in its procedures and methods of control. Policy is now determined by a representative assembly composed of delegates from the local and state affiliated associations, though the structure of the Association is still cumbersome in many respects. The proposal, in 1920, of a group of superintendents of schools that the Department of Superintendence secede from the N.E.A. fortunately won little support, and a

serious split between teachers and administrators was thus avoided.

With a record of distinguished service, the N.E.A. is today performing many valuable functions. After the reorganization, the membership grew rapidly and is now about two hundred thousand. A research department was established, a journal was launched that circulates to the entire membership, and the association became much more active in its advocacy of Federal aid and of other measures. Much more attention has been given to the social aspects of education in the programs of its meetings and in the studies made by its committees. In 1935 the association set up a Commission on Educational Policies that has already brought out important reports, including "The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy," "The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy," and "The Purposes of Education in American Democracy," and is engaged on other important studies.

The rise to influence of other national organizations must be explained in part by the earlier failure of the N.E.A. to meet with boldness and imagination some of the most critical issues confronting education. There was some indication that the initiative in education was passing to other organizations such as the American Council on Education, the Progressive Education Association, and to the American Federation of Teachers. In recent years, however, the association has again been much more vigorous in its leadership. An examination of the reports of its committees and of the resolutions adopted by the association and by its various departments compels the conclusion that no organization has spoken with more clarity on the basic social problems confronting education. Like all other teachers' organizations the N.E.A. has now come to a critical juncture in

its history. It is faced with the necessity of defining much more clearly its position on the critical social problems confronting education and the profession. Its future usefulness will depend on whether liberal or conservative influences finally prevail in its counsels.

The impact of the Progressive Education Association on American education through its conferences, researches, and publications has been most salutary. But it, too, is faced with the same dilemma that confronts other organizations. The leading spokesmen for the movement, although stressing the social nature of education and insisting that the school should concern itself with actual social problems, have at the same time held that method is the vital consideration in education and have strongly opposed any form of "indoctrination." As one has phrased it, the school "should avoid teaching the pupils what to think, even about a democratic form of government." Others in this movement have maintained that education should be carried on in a definite democratic frame of reference as regards purpose, content, *and method* and that economic and social conditions and proposals for reconstruction should be examined in the light of the meaning of democracy today—in short, that the school must be concerned with what youth think about the problems of contemporary American life. The membership of this association, now about ten thousand, has doubled in the last ten or twelve years. Originally, the active membership was confined largely to teachers in progressive private schools, but today teachers from the public schools constitute a majority. The association is now engaged in an attempt to work out more clearly its educational and social philosophy. Concerned primarily with the direction, content, and method of education, this society has supplied a needed emphasis and has an important function to perform.

To discharge this function the society must now accept an educational philosophy that comes to grips with the operational meanings of democracy in our economic, political, and social life today.

The American Federation of Teachers, which now has a membership of some thirty thousand, also faces serious problems. The labor situation was in some respects more propitious for unionism among teachers when the federation was founded twenty years ago than at the present time, for labor is now divided into two hostile camps. Neither wing of the movement has achieved a clear economic and political orientation, though in some respects the C.I.O. seems more socially-minded and progressive than the older organization. Traditionally, organized labor in this country has been interested primarily in strictly trade-union objectives and methods, in obtaining better wages and conditions of work, and has been opposed to affiliation with a particular political party. Today the belief is growing in the ranks of labor that the problems of employment and security can be solved only as the economy is reconstructed and that labor must rely in larger measure on political action.

It is argued that teachers can accomplish more within the labor movement than outside of it. As we have seen, this surely depends on circumstances at a particular time and in a particular situation. It is significant that in 1935 a group of almost a thousand teachers, containing many of its charter members, were driven out of Local 5 of the American Federation of Teachers in New York City by the activities of communists and other left-wing political sects who, though in a minority, were able to control the local. Among those driven out were Dr. Henry Linville, an outstanding leader in the federation from its inception, and Dr. John Dewey. Recently other nationally known liberal educators have resigned

from the New York locals in protest against the dominance and tactics of these same sects. Today the sects are waging an internecine war within these locals and in the national organization that threatens the whole union movement. It is this element more than any other that perpetuates the notion that the boss-worker relationships obtains in education and that employs tactics that are at many points inconsistent with the principles of democracy. In Chicago the union has been, in recent years, a vigorous and constructive influence in the struggle to build a public opinion that will wrest the control of the schools of that city from the politicians and will assure adequate civic and financial support. Over half the teachers of the city now belong to the union.

The American Federation of Teachers has rendered an important service in its fight for academic freedom, for participation of teachers in policy making, for freedom from deadening mechanical supervision, and for the securement of adequate salary, tenure, and pension legislation. Its most important service has undoubtedly been in the social education of teachers both within and without the movement. The contribution that the Federation of Teachers could make is much needed at the present time. Its greatest usefulness in the immediate future lies mainly in the direction of the political education of the profession and in pioneering in collaboration not only with labor but with other political groups. The teachers' union, like the Progressive Education Association, has done and can do much to move the N.E.A. and other state and local organizations in the direction in which they should go. This good work is now endangered by internal factional struggles, particularly in certain locals. The federation needs, above all, to clarify its social and educational philosophy and

objectives and to make clear that it will not tolerate methods that are not democratic or that are inconsistent with the highest conception of professional procedure, so that liberal-minded teachers may feel free to join it. That this is the point of view of the great majority of the members of the organization the country over cannot be doubted.[1]

A significant development is the growing influence of the foundations and of the American Council on Education. Only in the last decade have the foundations given much attention to general problems of elementary and secondary education, but in recent years large grants have been made for the study of education at these levels and for the study of the problems of youth. Much of the research financed by these foundations is now carried out under the auspices of the American Council on Education. The council is composed of representatives from various educational organizations, foundations, schools, colleges, and universities—public, private, and parochial. The council was undoubtedly very influential in the appointment of the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

Every grant made by a foundation involves decisions of great moment to American democracy and education. These grants involve decisions as to what problems are important to be studied and as to what educators are most competent to conduct the studies. It is doubtful whether either the educational profession or the public is aware of the extent to which education is today influenced by those who control and dispense these

[1] The deliberations of the annual convention of the federation at Buffalo in August, 1939, since the above was written, indicate that this majority will prevail in its counsels and that this national organization will play an increasingly important and constructive role in American education and life.

funds. Usually the funds are granted "without strings." Much of the experimentation and research carried out on these grants is of great value. But one must be very naïve to believe that those who have the power to distribute these funds have no social orientation or no ideas as to what they would like to see achieved socially through the American school. The truth is that those who allocate these funds are selective as to the problems to be investigated, the methods to be employed in the investigations, and particularly with reference to the educators who are to carry on the investigations. The foundations are willing to support only those educational activities, researches, and institutions that are under "sound" leadership. It has been good fortune that the direction of these foundations has, with some exceptions, been in the hands of men of liberal intellectual and social outlook.

A Social Program for the Organized Profession

It is obviously not possible and would be presumptuous to attempt to outline here a solution for all of the crucial problems of purpose, organization, method, and affiliation that confront the organized profession at the present time. My purpose has been rather to analyze the problem, to indicate the broad objectives for which teachers' organizations must work and the principles in accordance with which they should operate. However, some guiding principles and some elements of such a program do emerge from our analysis. These I shall attempt to summarize briefly.

1. Organization is essential for the discharge of the profession's collective educational and social responsibilities.

2. Teachers' organizations should stimulate their members everywhere to the study of education in its

broadest and deepest social relationships. This study is already under way but needs to be greatly extended and intensified.

3. These associations should work to make every American school a school for democracy, a school in which children and youth and adults make a realistic study of the problems of democracy in our time and a school which, in all of its practices, embodies the principles of democracy.

4. Organized teachers should work for the actual realization of the ideal of equality of educational opportunity in the United States, so that no boy or girl, because of the economic status of his family, will ever be denied the educational opportunity to which he is entitled. This involves the extension of the principles of state-supported schools, of Federal support for general education at all levels, and of subsistence grants to economically underprivileged children and youth wherever necessary.

5. Organized teachers should work for the strengthening of teacher-training institutions, including both the state teachers' colleges and university schools of education. They should insist upon a much more thorough preparation for the teacher, one that will include a thorough grounding in the foundations of education.

6. The organized profession must courageously resist all antidemocratic movements in this country, organized and unorganized, all attempts to suppress our civil liberties, to interfere with freedom of teaching and the rights of teachers as citizens.

7. Educational organizations concerned with problems of policy should take their stand squarely with the masses of the American people in the battle for democracy against the forces of privilege and reaction. They cannot be indifferent to the economic maladjustments that have deprived the majority of American citizens of economic security.

8. The social and political education of teachers must, then, be in the future one of the most important functions of the organized profession.

9. The profession must cooperate with those organized groups in American society working for the protection of democracy and for the realization of the democratic ideal through the utilization of the resources of the country in the interests of all its people. This will call for collaboration with labor unions, with organizations of farmers, with various cultural, welfare, and professional groups. The time may well soon come when active participation in a liberal political movement will be essential to the protection of democracy.

10. The organized profession should, of course, continue to carry on the study of education in its more technical aspects and should concern itself with the interests of teachers wherever these interests are in the public interest.

The leading teachers' organizations of the country have been moving in a very encouraging way in the direction of a more realistic facing of their social responsibilities. These organizations have now, however, come to a fork in the road, to a place where they must make fundamental decisions, where they must choose whether they will continue as a constructive force for democracy or, perhaps unconsciously, and with the best of intentions, throw the weight of their influence on the side of reaction. The responsibility for this choice is one that is shared by every member of the profession. The writer, for one, is fully aware of his own responsibilities and of his own sins of commission and of omission. This is the time for all to take stock.

The Need for Unity of Action

A plurality of organizations is plainly unavoidable under present conditions. But plurality of organization

need not of itself mean division in the ranks of education. The present situation calls for the closest cooperation, particularly between such organizations as the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the Progressive Education Association. The former is the logical organization to take the lead in fostering this cooperation and in bringing about unity of effort.

X

EDUCATION AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

THE reasons for the deepening concern of the American people about education become apparent in the light of an analysis such as has been made in the preceding chapters.

"Education is a form of social action." The purpose of education is to modify behavior, to make the individual a different person from what he would otherwise be. It is for this reason that educational policy is always social policy and that, in the modern world, the school is employed, deliberately, for the achievement of definite social purposes, becomes, in fact, a crucial element in national policy.

Education as Social Policy

It is out of a failure to comprehend the social nature of the educative process that much of the confusion as to social purposes and the social consequences of organized education arises today. In the minds even of many serious students of the problem true education has nothing to do with social policy, is not, and in the nature of the case, cannot be concerned with building in the individual particular social attitudes toward the prob-

lems of a particular culture at a particular time. In the words of President Robert M. Hutchins:

> One purpose of education is to draw out the elements of our common human nature. These elements are the same in any time and place. The notion of educating a man to live in any particular time or place, to adjust him to any particular environment, is, therefore, foreign to a true conception of education.
>
> Education implies teaching. Teaching implies knowledge. Knowledge is truth. The truth is everywhere the same. Hence education should be everywhere the same. I do not overlook the possibilities of differences in organization, in administration, in local habits and customs. These are details. I suggest that the heart of any course of study designed for the whole people will be, if education is rightly understood, the same at any time, in any place, under any political, social, or economic conditions. . . .[1]

A pronouncement of this kind from such an eminent source has enough of truth in it to be doubly dangerous. There *are* elements in knowledge and education that have become truly the heritage of all mankind. For example, the modern world is indebted to the ancient Greeks for many invaluable and enduring contributions to culture and thought. Yet it is difficult to understand how such a theory as that set forth by President Hutchins can be advanced in the face of modern scholarship and the conditions existing in the contemporary world. Such a dictum ignores much that anthropology, history, and philosophy have taught us. Neither education nor "truth" are in all respects the same in contemporary America as in ancient Greece or ancient China or in a primitive culture—or in Nazi Germany. Fascism requires

[1] Robert Maynard Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America*, Yale University Press, 1936.

one kind of education, democracy, another; for education always affects social habits and social attitudes.

Four principal attitudes toward the relation of education to social processes, social problems, and social change are discernible in this country today. These views are often implicit in policies actually pursued rather than explicit in pronouncements—a fact that only adds to the general confusion. One of the gravest dangers in the present situation is the failure of educators to understand the actual effects of educational practices. There is no greater need than that of subjecting practice to searching analysis so that its actual social implications may be lifted to the level of consciousness. As serious damage may be done by the well-meaning who are uninformed as by avowed enemies of democracy who know what they are doing. But some of the proponents of some of the views that I shall now examine do not believe in democracy and freedom of inquiry, at least not in all areas of experience. Some are believers in authoritarian systems and practices that in the sphere of their operations negate both the scientific method and the principles of democracy. Let us examine briefly these four points of view.

1. One school of thought holds that education has a universal character that transcends all temporal manifestations, all historic periods, all cultures, that is valid without reference to time or place. This view implies a system of absolutes. Knowledge is the same everywhere. Ethical values are the same everywhere and always. Education is a search for universal truth. This is, in essence, the teaching of that medieval authoritarianism that was rooted in the Platonic metaphysics. Usually some group or some authority assumes that it has *the* truth or that it alone has access to the truth, though that was not the spirit of Greek philosophy.

At one time it was the medieval church that, for example, had the "truth" in the Ptolemaic explanation of the heavenly bodies and their movements, that was intolerant of the scientific discoveries of Galileo and Copernicus, and that sought to compel acceptance. This philosophy has generally assumed a higher and a lower order of reality and of knowledge that correspond in a striking and significant manner to the higher and lower orders of society. This is the philosophical outlook that has so long been employed to justify the existing order of things in the Western world: the social arrangements of the feudal system or property rights as against human rights under that economic system known as capitalism.

> The real world is supersensuous; it is non-material and unchangeable; it is made up of certain eternal and immutable essences . . . called ideas. . . . Our ideas of truth, goodness, and beauty are valid ideas, not by the test of experience but by their correspondence or conformity to the supreme essences which go by the same name.[1]

The rise of modern science and the growth of the ideals and practices of democracy have challenged this system of thought, but it is still powerful in the world today. Most authoritarian systems, whether political, moral, or religious, stem back in some way to Plato, whose Republic was a prototype for dictatorships in all times and places.

It is highly essential that the implications of this philosophy be understood. It is inimical to the modern spirit—to the spirit and the method of modern science and to the spirit of democracy. It will employ science, but to its own ends. Certain areas of life will always be

[1] Boyd H. Bode, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*, pp. 21–22, Newson and Company, 1938.

closed to scientific inquiry. Even Dr. Hutchins has this to say on the subject of science: "The study would not proceed from the most recent observations back to first principles, but *from first principles* to whatever recent observations were significant in understanding them. . . . The higher learning is concerned primarily with *thinking* about fundamental problems."[1] This surely puts the cart before the horse. Thinking about fundamental problems is certainly needed in the world today as never before, but unfettered and searching inquiry and assembling of verified data pertaining to these problems is also needed and is necessary to fruitful thinking. To begin with "first principles," if we may judge by the history of thought in the Western world, means to begin with a set of unexamined assumptions. Such a doctrine condemns us to the intellectual sterility of medieval scholasticism in the critical areas of politics, morals, and economics.

It is time that American educators see and fully understand where such a doctrine leads. This is not an attack on President Hutchins, who has rendered distinguished service both to public education and to democracy. Many who have not freed themselves from these traditional concepts of the nature of knowledge and of truth, of the source of moral values, and of the nature of education are sincere believers in democracy. The danger is that many do not see, in the words of Professor Gideonse, that

> The Great Tradition in metaphysics, to which Mr. Hutchins seeks to recall the university, seemed to hold that after confrontation with a certain amount of data it could reach first principles which were absolute and subject to no further modification. And so under the emotional seduction of having

[1] Hutchins, *op. cit.* (italics mine, J. H. N.)

achieved absolute truth, an early and in itself noble stage of thought came to be considered the final stage of thought.[1]

The effect of this doctrine can only be, then, to stifle the inquiry and thought that are now so much needed in the realm of politics and morals, for the baffling social and economic problems of our times are fundamentally moral and political problems. The philosophy under review can and will always be employed to justify the *status quo* with all its injustices, just as Hegel employed it a century ago to confer validity on the autocratic Prussian state. The persistence of this conception in the modern world would be amazing did history not teach us that privilege never surrenders its advantages without a struggle, for, to quote Professor Bode again, it is difficult to understand why "a modern man should pass by all that science and racial experience may have to say on the subject and lightheartedly assume that this ancient theory makes sense or that the absolutes are anything but human prejudices invested with a halo and put on ice."[2]

This theory scornfully rejects the notion that education has anything to do with social policy. But the theory itself has the deepest social implications; it serves today as the underpinning of the most reactionary of social policies. It commits education in the end to social sterility and thus to becoming the handmaiden of reaction. I do not see how any other interpretation can be placed upon its operational effects.

2. According to a second view, which may or may not be supported by theoretical foundations, education is an instrument to be used for instillation in the young of loyalty to a predetermined set of social ideals—in other

[1] Harry D. Gideonse, *The Higher Learning in a Democracy*, Farrar and Rinehart, 1937.

[2] Bode, *op. cit.*

words for plain propaganda purposes. This may be propaganda for desired social change or for the maintenance of the *status quo*. The purpose is not to educate the individual in the sense of bringing about a full development of his intellectual powers and of making him intellectually a free man. The purpose is not an objective search for truth. The purpose is rather to limit freedom of inquiry, of aesthetic creation and expression, of speech and of publication in recognition of the fact that intelligence is always dangerous to vested interests, to privilege, and to dogmatism of whatever kind. The forces seeking to prevent desirable and essential economic and social reconstruction unhesitatingly, though in most instances unconsciously, resort to this method. The forces of reaction do not hesitate to use the schools for their own purposes, either by overt or subtle pressures or through legislative or administrative control.

We see this policy in operation in the fascist states today and also in Russia, for there, too, freedom of inquiry, freedom of speech, and of publication are rigidly proscribed. The theoretical foundations and the avowed economic purposes of the Russian regime were originally fundamentally different from those of the fascist regimes. This regime has collectivised the instruments of production and has professed its intention to abolish class distinctions; it was dedicated to the promotion of the welfare of every individual; fascism openly perpetuates the inequalities and class distinctions of the existing economic system, at the same time utterly destroying the values of liberalism and democracy. Theoretically, the dictatorship of the proletariat is supposed to wither away under communism and be replaced by democracy. In Russia, however, the dictatorship is stronger today than it was twenty years ago—more vigilant, more complete in the areas of its operation, and

more ruthless, as the purges and recent aggressions in alliance with Hitler have made plain. Americans doubtless have something to learn from the Russian experiment, but the course of dictatorship should be a warning to us, and in no respect more than in the intellectual realm and in education. *It is inconceivable that autocracy and intellectual proscription can ever be employed as instruments of democracy.*

The principle that at bottom underlies this social and educational policy is force, sheer brute force. It may be shocking to some of the well-intentioned advocates of the limitation of freedom of teaching in this country to remind them that they, too, are seeking to control men's minds by force. But no other conclusion is admissible, for all attempts to enslave men's minds must, in the end, rely on authority or force. All in the end assume the validity of a system of predetermined absolutes. It is for this reason that the philosophical idealism derived in various forms from the philosophy of Plato or from St. Thomas Aquinas becomes the theoretical support of so many contemporary authoritarian systems. The Communist party, and certain other left-wing sects organized and operating on the principle of the Communist party, have made of the Marxian doctrines a new absolutism. It was, no doubt, the danger of such absolutism that led Marx himself on one occasion to cry out against "the Marxians."

Again, all these groups trying to confine teaching within definite grooves, whether in the interest of the *status quo* or otherwise, support the argument that education always has its social consequences, that educational policy is always social policy. If education did not affect the attitudes and behavior of men, these interests would not be so concerned about it. As we have seen, too much authoritarianism inheres today in our educa-

tional practices. This authoritarianism is in large measure a heritage from the past that has been accepted uncritically.

3. The third point of view need not be elaborated in great detail at this point.[1] This has been the dominant view of progressive education. According to this conception, education is a social process that always has social consequences.

Education is essential to the perpetuation of democracy, but the school must not educate directly *for* democracy. That would be to defeat the purpose of democracy that emphasizes the vital importance of freedom. More important, it would not be, in the true sense, education. Controversial problems should be studied in the school, but the teacher should not aim directly at building in youth allegiance to any particular conception of the ends and means of human welfare. Awareness seems to be the key word of this school of thought. A recent tentative formulation of a philosophy for progressive education holds that

> We look to education, in short, to make the culture aware of itself in order that its essential values may be made more effective. Education is thus to be put in the service of the democratic culture not to be dominated by it, but to function as an agency conscious of its obligation to free the individual and the culture alike from the domination of hysterical leaders, authoritarian values, fragmentary ideals, and the inertia of ignorance.[2]

This report lists the characteristics of democratic personality as social sensitivity, tolerance, cooperativeness, disposition and ability to use reflective thinking, creativeness, self-direction, aesthetic appreciations, and, of

[1] See Chaps. I, V, VI.

[2] A Tentative Report of the Committee on Philosophy of Education, Progressive Education Association, 1939.

course, respect for human personality. Another admirable and penetrating statement of this general position appeared some time ago in the journal, *Progressive Education:*

What is the duty of education to the social order in a democratic country?

Objectives for education are incomplete without full consideration of the society in which pupils are to live, and to the carrying on and improvement of which they should contribute.

But social systems tend to use the schools as an effective means to perpetuate themselves. Is it consistent with such basic ideals of democracy as freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of continuance or change of institutions as the people themselves shall at any time decide, for a democratic form of government to teach its children to perpetuate our present-day society as other systems teach their children to perpetuate theirs? I think not.

The schools of a democracy are in duty bound, however, to do the following things:

1. They should acquaint their pupils with what is significant in man's progress from savagery to and including his present stage of civilization.

2. They should teach their pupils to think as clearly as they are able to do. Implied in this is training against the influences of prejudice and propaganda, fears, and selfishness. It involves the study and free discussion of moot questions, and the forming of opinions, though often only tentative ones.

3. They should make clear the difference between the ideals of democracy and the fundamentals of other ideologies.

4. They should give their pupils experience in carrying on group affairs, and should give them such contact with community affairs and participation in them as proves possible and valuable.

5. They should avoid teaching the pupils *what* to think, even about a democratic form of government.[1]

[1] Eugene Randolph Smith, *Progressive Education*, May, 1938.

This is a point of view that is entitled to the utmost respect. The emergence of this conception was one of the most significant developments in the history of education because of its emphasis on the critical function of thinking. The problems with which this conception is concerned are complex, and the dangers are great. Education must aim, first of all, at the building of minds that are sensitive to the social realities of the world in which they live, that are free, that have acquired the capacity for thinking for themselves, because they have had opportunity to think for themselves. But to me these formulations, despite their many excellencies, contain inconsistencies and are inadequate. The first formulation sets objectives so broad and general as to be almost meaningless for the guidance of education with reference to the most critical issues now confronting American society. Freedom of thought, speech, and press are democratic values. To foster these values is to foster democracy. There is no escaping the fact, however, that the maintenance of such values will always be dependent on certain external conditions, on economic security for the individual, to cite but one example. All will agree, I think, that education cannot be indifferent to the conditions in the social order that threaten the very existence of democracy. These external conditions must be subjects of study. But, it is argued by the proponents of the view under consideration:

The development of a scientific attitude toward social problems, rather than indoctrination, is the goal. While controversial issues of social life should define certain of the materials of the good curriculum, this does not mean that the schools should teach children what to think regarding these issues. Indeed such indoctrination would be contrary to the very spirit which demands a study of such issues. The understanding that such indoctrination would defeat the very purpose of education

makes the problem of centering the curriculum on the social studies more approachable. To *think*, not *what* to think, is the good curriculum's objective for the child.[1]

Surely this doctrine can no longer be accepted as an adequate statement of the purpose and method of education for democracy. To me it now seems clear that if education is to serve democracy, it must build in youth understanding of its problems and implications and an informed loyalty to democracy as a way, the best way of life. Education that does not dispose to action is not education. To win youth thus to democracy is to assure the preservation of the "essential values" of our culture, such as freedom of inquiry, speech, and press, religious freedom, freedom of teaching, and government by the people. A century ago democracy was truly evangelical. Has it lost its vitality? Will it be able to withstand the onslaughts of authoritarianism in the twentieth century if it has not the will to make converts to its values? For that matter, do not these formulations in reality recognize the necessity of winning youth to the democratic ideal?

The point is that this view seems to hold that the *method* of education is more important than purpose or content and, therefore, cannot be controlled by a democratic social frame of reference such as has been developed in the preceding pages. A process of education is by this doctrine made a sort of absolute. Social conditions are to be studied but not actually appraised in the light of such an interpretation of the meaning of democracy for the United States today as was, for example, set forth in Chap. IV. It is not essential that youth should see that *laissez faire* is no longer workable, that the economy must be brought more under demo-

[1] The Department of Superintendence, *Tenth Yearbook*, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1932.

cratic social control, that the absence of economic security for millions is undermining democracy, that more extensive economic planning is essential.

In the hands of such educators as the authors of these statements, the method under review would have a cutting edge. The learner would be squarely confronted with the actualities of social conditions and of social problems. Thinking would be stimulated, and thinking is always dangerous to the *status quo*. But this theory, followed to its logical conclusion, *compels the teacher to avoid the steps essential to enabling the learner to see and make as his own the only possible inferences in many critical situations involving the principles, values, needs, and instrumentalities of democracy. It means that in actual practice the schools of democracy would be freed from direct concern for the future of democracy.* Incredible though it may appear, this seems the only possible deduction from this doctrine when carried to its logical conclusion. The danger is that the school would thus appear always in a deceptive cloak of liberalism. Pressed to its limits, this theory might well, in time of crisis, so sterilize education as to make it a perfect support for social reaction and thus provide teachers an escape from danger in a time of social conflict and uncertainty. To hold that this procedure is the only alternative to teaching a blue print of a new social order is unrealistic, for there is a vast difference between enabling youth to understand the necessity of an extension of democratic social control of the economy, or of planning, and teaching a blue print for the new order.

4. A fourth view of the relation of education to social problems and social change has been presented in these pages. The conception of education as experience is the only conception suited to democracy. The process of true education, education that seeks to free men and not to

enslave them, is vital. Intellectual freedom is one of the fundamental ideals and conditions of democracy. Through the practice of this freedom the individual should be made conscious of its value and loyal to it. But since education always has positive social consequences, it should be deliberately planned for the achievement of purposes deemed desirable.

To this end, education should seek to give youth understanding of the operational meaning of democracy in our time in all its bearings—economic, political, social, moral, and aesthetic. Social conditions should be studied and appraised in accordance with this meaning. This does not mean the teaching of detailed blue prints of a particular plan for social reconstruction, for that would be inconsistent with the experimental character of education and of democracy. All proposals for social reconstruction should be examined and evaluated in accordance with the values and needs of democracy. Youth should be led to see the relationship between economic security for the individual and the preservation of democracy. The highly integrated character of our economy and the necessity for increased control of the instruments and processes of production and distribution by all the people in the interest of *all* the people should be made clear. The values as well as the defects that have inhered in economic individualism and in the historic conception of liberalism should also be made clear. The inequalities and the injustices in the distribution of the national income and the danger of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few in a democracy should also be made very clear. All important points of view should be fairly considered. Nothing would be concealed. No critical problem would be evaded. But education should, nevertheless, be consciously planned to win American youth to loyalty to democracy thus

interpreted. *And loyalty to democracy thus interpreted means loyalty to the ideals of freedom of inquiry, freedom of thought, of speech, of publication.*

This conception frankly recognizes that moulding of the individual is unavoidable. All education is a process of influencing the development of the mind and of attitudes. To bring the child into the environment of the school is to make him a different individual from what he would otherwise be. If education is to foster democracy, it must be consciously designed to build in the individual those qualities essential to effective participation in a democracy. This conception of education will be vigorously opposed by many interests in society. But it should be supported by all who are devoted to the interests of the common man and to the principles of democracy, for there is no time to lose. The responsibility that this conception imposes on teachers as a functional group has already been considered.

The kinship of the first two points of view considered has been pointed out. Under the conception that truth is universal, that education has no concern with a particular culture but only with eternal verities, the teacher withdraws into an ivory tower so far as the world of present realities is concerned. By failing to come to grips with present realities education betrays the cause of democracy. Under the second conception the teacher is but a tool of the dominant forces in society. The kinship of the third and fourth points of view is also evident. Both conceptions take account of the social nature and purpose of the educative process. The danger in the third conception is that it may lead to a specious neutrality. The fourth conception makes of the school a truly creative and constructive force for democracy and frankly recognizes the political and social responsibilities of the organized teaching profession in a democracy.

The third and fourth conceptions stem from the same school of philosophical and social thought. Both wings of this school of thought have the same broad objectives in view. But the third view holds that, *in his capacity as teacher*, the teacher must refrain from deliberate attempts to influence the views of the learner even with reference to the most fundamental social problems.

The Myth of Neutrality

Nothing could be more perilous than a policy of drift in education. There remains to be examined, then, the question of whether education can ever be neutral.

This problem is complicated by the widespread acceptance among educators of the belief that education is always controlled by the *will* of society. There are, of course, always large areas in which a consensus has been reached as to what constitutes desirable moral conduct. The vast majority of Americans are, for example, agreed as to the greater desirability of democracy as compared with any other social system. But even in the areas of politics and morals there are serious disagreements. For example, the practice of charity has always been proclaimed, and is proclaimed today, as one of the greatest virtues, but in a society that made efficient use of its natural and technological resources and that had genuine respect for personality, charity would be unnecessary. It would be not only unnecessary but socially undesirable because of its effect on the recipient. Charity would be a vice and not a virtue. In the minds of many the conception of charity has no place in the modern world. Moral values are thus affected by changing conditions. And so in 1939, direct relief, that is, the dole, for the unemployed able to work is vigorously opposed by many on moral and social grounds. They contend that it is the social and moral

obligation of society to provide steady employment at decent wages for all able to work and that the obligation to care for those unable to work is not an obligation to charity but a debt that society owes to individuals whose misfortunes are no fault of their own but are, in fact, usually products of undesirable social conditions. Or, again, although we may and do have an overwhelming consensus in favor of democracy, we are by no means agreed as to the economic and political measures required to implement the democratic ideal today.

When we look closely at American society or at the public, we discern at once that in many of its manifestations it is not unitary but plural in character. Certainly two of the most important characteristics of our society are its class structure and the powerful interest groups contained within it. What we call the will of society or public opinion is likely to be the will or the opinion of the most articulate groups or class in society. The groups with the greatest resources, the ablest advocates, the best organization are most articulate and most influential in the formation of the "public mind." But these groups may not in reality represent the thought or the best interests of the people. As we have seen, the great masses of the people lack organization and are today neither articulate nor well-informed as to their own best interests. American history affords abundant evidence that with our democratic institutions and traditions the interests of the people need not suffer defeat in the contest of democracy and enlightenment against privilege or ignorance. But the issues are often not clear. And it is in the critical controversial areas in which a consensus consistent with the requirements of enlightenment and of democracy has not been attained that the educator encounters his most difficult problems. In these areas the educator has no clear mandate except the general

mandate to make education, to the limit of his intelligence and understanding, an agency of enlightenment and democracy.

Let us examine more closely the problem that confronts the educator in such a situation and the choice he must make. In the nature of the case neutrality is impossible in education in a critical field in which a consensus has not yet been attained. For the school to avoid consideration of controversial issues is to play into the hands of the forces opposed to all change. To study controversial problems without attempting appraisal in terms of a considered conception of the needs of democracy is likewise a concession to the interests opposed to the study of critical, economic, political, social, and moral problems in the school. Any form of neutrality, paradoxical though it may seem, becomes a form of positive social action. In the field of social conflict, to do nothing is to do something. The "neutral" teacher or educational leader throws the weight of his influence on the side of opposition to change. In some instances change should be opposed. But it should be opposed deliberately in the light of the most intelligent possible analysis of conditions and needs.

The impossibility of neutrality in social affairs is well illustrated by the efforts of the United States to pursue a neutral policy in its foreign relations through the application of the neutrality laws in the Ethiopian and Spanish conflicts. To forbid the shipment of arms to both sides in such a situation is to aid the stronger. By making it impossible for the Spanish government as well as Franco to purchase much-needed war supplies here, the United States actually helped Franco to win. When this was once clearly understood, a shift in public sentiment with reference to these laws was immediately noticeable and doubtless explains the

fact that there was no considerable outcry for application of these laws to the war which Japan is waging against China. For those in a position to choose a course of action neutrality is simply impossible in any contest between the strong and the weak or between ignorance and enlightenment. This is not to argue that the United States should participate in foreign wars. It simply means that it is unwise to deceive ourselves as to the effects of "neutrality." It is to argue that our policy should always be a positive one formulated in the light of the facts, for our strength and influence in the world are so great that *any* course we pursue in international affairs will have its positive effects on other nations. And so it is in education. The influence of the schools will be thrown on one side or the other in the struggle between democracy and the forces opposed to democracy. The forces opposed to democracy could ask no more of education than that it be indifferent to this struggle, that it should not attempt to give youth a realistic picture of contemporary life, that it should be "neutral."

Educators should, therefore, make up their minds as to the kind of society they consider possible and desirable in this country in the proximate future and as to the educational program that will contribute most to the building of that society. It does not follow that educators should attempt to arrogate to themselves the sole direction of social change. The conclusion is inescapable, however, that schools and teachers *will* play an important role in determining the *direction* of social change, even if they endeavor to keep entirely out of fields of controversy or to follow a course of strict "neutrality." One is reminded of the cry of the lowly Nazarene, "He who is not for me is against me." Educational policy should, then, be formulated by the profession and by the public in the light of the history of

American democratic ideals and in the light of contemporary social conditions and needs. The truth of the matter is that *the public mind is never made but is always in the making.* Upon the profession of education, then, rests the inescapable responsibility of making choices. A policy of "doing nothing," of avoiding choices is impossible. Such a policy is registered in the education of youth, for youth is deprived of the education that it should have. The educational leader, then, has no alternative but to lead! Educators have no alternative but to decide in what direction the influence of education will be exerted. This decision they *will* make whether they will to make it or not, whether they make it consciously or not.

The notion that a dynamic society has definitely expressed its will with regard to what should be taught in the schools and that the educator can know with finality what the will of society is at any particular time, is most naïve. Such an assumption betrays a woeful lack of knowledge of the nature of culture, of social processes, and of the forces operative in American society today. This notion is the great educational illusion of our time! It is the great alibi for educational inaction.

The Meaning of This Choice

It is imperative that the meaning of this choice be made perfectly clear, for the issues can be easily obscured and have been too largely obfuscated by much of current educational discussion, especially with reference to the evils of "indoctrination." Education for democracy in our time does not impose an impossible burden either on the school or on the teaching profession, though such a realistic program will be and is being vigorously opposed on the grounds that the "schools should not be employed for propaganda purposes" or

"to undermine American institutions." We are agreed that they should not be used either for propaganda purposes or for the undermining of American democratic institutions. Just where, then, is the seat of the difficulty? The difficulty arises when education seeks to make the critical social issues of our time clear in all their bearings, to examine the realities back of symbols and stereotypes, to cut through the mythology that provides so many spurious explanations for economic and political phenomena, that supplies the only theoretical basis for much of current economic practice. A few illustrations will suffice.

The American people have been told that old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and other items in a social-security program are socialistic, therefore bad and "un-American." Government financing of housing projects or ownership of electric utilities, government regulation of hours and wages, laws protecting workers in their right of collective bargaining, taxation for the purpose of effecting a redistribution of wealth are all socialistic and therefore bad, undemocratic, and un-American. These policies may be good or they may be bad. In the opinion of the writer we need to move in this general direction, for reasons that have been set forth. But how is the goodness or badness of such proposals to be judged? By their economic and social effects. If such policies are carefully formulated after searching analyses of conditions and needs, if they are carried out democratically, and if they benefit the common people, they are good. The principle of the democratic as over against the dictatorial method and the principle of the general welfare are the paramount considerations. It is the function of education to make clear that a policy is neither good nor bad by reason of its being "capitalistic" or "socialistic." It is the

responsibility of education, however, to make clear that economic insecurity is today a threat to democracy, that continued unemployment for millions is a menace to our liberties and to our peace and security, that government should assume responsibility for the promotion of the general welfare, and that government is the only authority competent to deal with many of the problems produced by the highly integrated industrial economy of the twentieth century. It is just as important to understand what this choice does not mean. It does not mean that the schools will become the tool of any political party or be employed to teach the blue prints of a new social order.

In brief, this choice means that education will come to grips honestly and realistically with the critical problems affecting the welfare of the people in our time in all areas of life—economic, political, social, moral, and intellectual. The schools will be above party. All important proposals will be fairly and searchingly examined. But education will always be carried on in a democratic frame of reference. This frame of reference will apply both to purpose and to content and method. The curriculum must be centered on the problems of our time. Administration and control must be democratic. Educational opportunity must be available to *all* equally and must in no respect be the privilege of the few who are favored economically. The schools must be kept free intellectually. Nor does it mean that culture will be neglected. Only in the fashion outlined can the schools in the truest sense become "a road to culture" for the masses of the people. Such a choice means, too, that educators must individually and collectively become a positive force in our political and social life. The discharge of this obligation and the exercise of their civic rights do not unfit them for teaching in accordance

with the most exacting conception of education in a free society. It will do so only if they become the mere tools of political groups inimical to the principles of democracy.

The Education of the Teachers

The success of this educational undertaking depends in large measure on the intellectual and professional equipment of the educator. Scholarship, as I have said in another connection, is demanded of the teacher—scholarship in the field of his own specialty and scholarship in the general field of education. The teacher or administrator must see his work in its larger social relationship, "must know what education is all about," must see the relation between ends and means.

For a long time teacher training consisted of little more than an attempt to give the novice some familiarity with the content of the actual subjects that he was to teach and some training in method. The emphasis on method was unavoidable in the face of the problem of furnishing the personnel required to staff a school system expanding as rapidly as the American system was in the century between 1830 and 1930. Rapid progress has been made in the last forty years. Standards for admission to teacher-training institutions and to the profession are being raised. The general and professional education offered in teacher-training institutions is of much better quality than a generation ago. Graduate schools of education have been established in nearly all the leading universities and include in their faculties some of the most distinguished scholars in the country.

The situation has been greatly improved but is by no means satisfactory. Many of the teachers' colleges maintained by states and municipalities are weak institutions, often poverty-stricken culturally and in-

tellectually, lacking in physical resources, with faculties that, with notable exceptions, are not well-equipped for their work. There are, of course, outstanding exceptions of teachers' colleges that provide both undergraduate and graduate instruction of the highest quality. But there is much to be said for the view that teachers should be educated in a college or university environment that makes available the requisite intellectual and cultural resources. Most of the state and city teachers' colleges should be expanded into good general colleges with strong educational departments. Such strong regional colleges are needed in most states. Some should doubtless be closed, for many were established for political reasons, not because they were really needed for the professional education of teachers. A large percentage of teachers are prepared in weak private and denominational colleges. Such institutions should be held to the strictest standards and the weak ones eliminated as teacher-training institutions.

Method is, of course, of vital importance but largely useless, indeed a positive menace, in the hands of the teacher or administrator or research worker or other specialist who does not bring to his work adequate intellectual equipment in the general field of educational theory and adequate preparation in the scientific and the social and philosophical foundations of education. The general criticism could still be brought against most schools of education that attention to techniques is out of proportion to the attention given to the nature and needs of the society that the school serves. But it is an encouraging sign that with the deepening of the economic, political, and intellectual crises, the center of gravity has begun to shift to a more adequate consideration of the social nature and consequences of the educative process. Our heritage in this respect is a

rich one, embracing as it does the work of such men as Jefferson and Franklin among the founders, Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, William T. Harris, Francis Parker, William James, and a group of contemporaries of which John Dewey has been the leading figure.

The task that now confronts the profession in the field of professional education is twofold. The curriculums of teachers' colleges and schools of education must be reconstructed. Greater emphasis must be placed on competent scholarship in the field of the teacher's specialty. The endless duplication of courses concerned with techniques must be reduced. The fiddle-faddle still characteristic of much of this instruction must be entirely eliminated. The prospective teacher must be thoroughly grounded in the scientific, social, psychological, and philosophical foundations of education. He must be equipped to understand the political, economic, and intellectual crises that grip the world today. The widest possible use must be made of the scientific and statistical method, but the study of education must be freed from the fetish of the quantitative. Teachers must come into possession of the knowledge of human behavior, of individual growth and personality that psychology and sociology have given us. The research connected with candidacy for the higher degrees must be directed to more fundamental problems and issues. Standards for entrance to the profession must be raised. Possession of a Master's degree or its equivalent should be required everywhere as the minimum qualification for admission to the profession. The Doctor's degree should become, and for that matter is rapidly becoming, the normal expectation for posts of major responsibility in the schools and teachers' colleges as well as in graduate schools of education. I say this notwithstanding the evils that are connected with the

prevalent tendency to make a fetish of degrees for the simple reason that some such measure of the adequateness of the teacher's formal preparation is essential, a necessary evil perhaps.

But this professional education can only be begun in the college and university. It is good if it has cultivated in the teacher an inquiring mind and the habits of reading and study and has given him a deep and absorbing interest in educational, social, and intellectual problems and deep social sympathies and understanding. This is the best test of the work of a school of education. But the teacher's professional education must continue in service. This need is especially acute at this time, when so few of us in service have had the advantage of the quality of professional education I have just described. The primary responsibility for the in-service education of teachers must be shared between administration and teachers' organizations. The whole educational enterprise, properly conceived and administered, becomes an educational experience for all engaged in it.

The professional education of the teacher is at this time of the most critical importance. The major responsibility for its improvement falls squarely on the profession itself.

Education and the Future of Democracy

The task that confronts education in our day is, then, preeminently a social and political task, for the modern world has come to the parting of the ways.

One way leads to authoritarianism, to dictatorship, to suppression of every manifestation of liberty and freedom, to intellectual and, for many, economic slavery, to the destruction of every value inherent in the great liberal and democratic traditions. If the forces of dictatorship and black reaction are triumphant over the forces

of democracy in the wars that now grip Europe and Asia and threaten the peace of all nations, the world may well be plunged into another dark age.

The other road is the road of democracy. It is a long and difficult road. But democracy cannot meet its problems by running away from them. Mussolini has asserted that as the nineteenth century was the century of liberalism, so the twentieth will be the century of fascism. This prophecy need not be fulfilled. It will not be fulfilled in the United States if those who believe in democracy have the courage of their convictions, if they are willing to sink all other differences in the fight for the maintenance of our democratic institutions and processes.

The task that confronts us is one of social strategy. We are threatened not only by stark reaction and by the authoritarians on the right but by the absolutists on the left who assert that they can employ authoritarian and autocratic methods to attain a democratic purpose. A social strategy must be fashioned for democracy. This strategy must recognize that the process of democracy is a gradual one. The right of revolution is a right that cannot be denied, one that was affirmed in our Declaration of Independence and by our war for independence. But under democracy revolution has been "institutionalized." Only autocracy can benefit by violent revolution in the United States of the twentieth century. Our safety will be assured only if desirable changes can be effected in time to prevent a revolutionary situation from developing. Promptness, celerity in effecting needed changes are, then, essential. Such a strategy must take account of the actualities of American life, of its class structure, its interest groups, what is good and what is undesirable in its traditions and in current conditions. Such a strategy must keep the

values and purposes of democracy always steadfastly in view and must never deviate either from these purposes or from the methods of democracy. The times call for a strategy that is both bold and resolute.

The role of education in all this is a critical one. Education is dependent on democracy, and democracy is dependent on education. The future of democracy and the future of education are inseparable. Democracy is education and education is democracy. If the American schools fail democracy in the great crisis that now confronts it, all will be lost. For the second time in our history education must be redirected and refashioned in order that it may effectively serve democracy in the new social order that is emerging, may become a constructive force in determining the shape of this new society. This is the challenge of our age to the educator. There is no time to lose.

INDEX

A

Absolutes, system of, 205–208, 210, 217
Academies, 90, 105
"Activity program," 100, 106
Acton, Lord, quoted, 147
Administration of education, 7, 126–149, 168
  for democracy, 138–149, 224
  function, 146–148
  principles, 139–141
  teacher and, 143–146, 181
Adult education, 7, 49, 96, 167
Africa, 19
Agrarian revolt, 32
Agriculture, 9, 24, 45
American Bar Association, 135, 182
American Council on Education, 182, 194, 198
American Federation of Labor, 177, 182, 190
American Federation of Teachers, 135, 176, 178, 182, 194, 196–197, 202
American Indians, 43
American Legion, 75, 135
American Revolution, 4, 20–21, 37, 104
American Telephone and Telegraph Company, 27
American traditions, 50–51
America's Capacity to Produce, 46–47, 153
Anti-Semitism, 49
Antitrust legislation, 56
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 33, 111, 210
Aristotle, 33
Arkansas, 158
Armaments, 19, 78
Arnold, *Folklore of Capitalism*, 20, 27
Assembly, freedom of, 21, 61, 74, 80, 98
Association of Land Grant Colleges, 135
Association of University Professors, 182
Australia, 19
Austria, 19, 61
Authoritarian state, 4, 59, 102, 128
Authoritarianism, 14, 33–35, 39, 54, 60, 78, 205–206, 228–229
  in education, 83, 86–87, 139, 210–211
Autocracy, 64–65
  in school administration, 127
Automobiles, 23–24, 46
Awareness, 211

B

Balkan states, 43
Barnard, Henry, 7, 90, 227
Beard, Charles A., 89, 128–129
Berle, Adolph A., Jr., 26–27, 71
Big business, 22
Binet, 10
Bingham, Alfred M., 38
Birth rate, decline, 44
Boards of control, 141–143
Boards of education, 131, 138–143, 147, 168
Bode, Boyd H., 206, 208
Borah, Senator, 32

"Bourgeoisie, big," 60
Brookings Institution, 46–47, 153
Bryan, William Jennings, 9
Business, 9, 22–23
  government regulation, 22
  influence on government, 5, 31
Business cycle, 22
Buying power, 22–23

C

California, 157
  University of, 154
Canada, 19
Capitalism, 13, 18–21, 26, 28–31, 50, 54–57, 73, 95–96, 102, 206, 216, 223
Capitalist classes, fascism and, 59–60
Capitalist democracies, 61, 69, 71
Capitalist parties, 61–62
Cartels, 22
Carter, 90
Cather, Willa, *My Antonia*, 43
Catholics, in Maryland, 40
Censorship, 66
Census of 1930, 30
Chain stores, 30
Chart of Plenty, 46–47
Chartist movement, 21
Chase, Stuart, 23
Chicago, 130, 197
  University of, 119
Child-centered education, 13, 117
Child labor, 77, 122, 180
Child Welfare Research Station, University of Iowa, 169
China, 19, 79–80, 221
Church, former authority, 92
C.I.O., 196
Citizenship, education for, 88–91
City manager, 48
Civic responsibilities of teachers, 172–175
Civil liberties, 21, 49–50, 62, 69, 74–75, 127, 180, 200
  as means and ends, 80, 98
Civil service, 29–30, 149
Civil War, 42, 176
Class distinctions, American attitude toward, 37, 49, 150
Class structure of American society, 29, 36–37, 135–138, 219, 229
Class struggle, 62, 75–76
Collective bargaining, 223
Collective ownership, 19, 56–57
Collectivism, 28, 70, 178
Colleges, 6–7, 90, 105–109, 123, 152–153, 168, 226, 228
  boards of trustees, 141–142
  curriculum, 118–120
  state, 6, 131
Colorado, school campaign, 185–189, 193
Colorado Education Association, 186–187, 189
Columbia College, 119
Coming American Fascism, 63
Comintern, 58–59
Commerce, free, 20–21
Commission government, 48
Common schools (*see* Public schools)
Communism, 5, 82, 102, 209
Communists, 5, 58–59, 61, 77, 196, 210
Community, former influence of, 91–92
  as laboratory, 14, 99
  as school, 154–156
  school and, 122–123
Community planning, 121
Competition, free, 21–22, 25, 54–55
Conditioning, 12, 83–84, 99
Conservation, of natural resources, 45, 72
Conservative party, 77–78, 80
Consideration, school, 131–133
Constitution, Federal, 130
Constitutional Convention, 130
Consumers' cooperatives, 56

Control of education, 4, 81–82, 126–149, 156–161, 168–170, 177
Cooperation, in democracy, 15, 68
  on frontier, 41
Cooperative movement, 49, 56–57, 73, 77
Copernieus, 206
Core curriculum, 119, 121
Corey, Lewis, 38
Corporate state, 60
Corporations, 22, 25–27, 55, 71, 74–75
  interlocking, 26
  limited-liability, 27
Cotton gin, 18
Coughlin, Father, 32, 75, 169
Counties, consolidation, 132–133
Counts, George S., 38, 105
Crisis, in civilization, causes, 20–28
  in democracy, 35–38
  economic, 29–31
  nature of, 18–20, 28–38
  political, 31–33
  in thought, 33–35
Crop control, 24
Culture, 87, 96, 111–112, 116, 124, 211
  and democracy, 94–98
Curriculum, 13–14, 141, 145, 213–214, 228
  contemporary, 112, 224
  core, 119, 121
  functional, 118–123
  legislation and, 5, 177
  planning, 113–117, 172
  reconstruction, 104–107
Cyr, Frank W., 157
Czechoslovakia, 19, 79
Czechs, 43

D

Data, assembling, 123
Daughters of the American Revolution, 135
De Garmo, 8
Declaration of Independence, 34, 41, 74, 229
Delaware, 157
Democracy, 11, 60, 209
  abroad, 79–80
  administration and, 147–149
  American belief in, 138, 189
  assets and resources, 39–42
  authoritarianism and, 33–35
  crisis in, 35–38
  culture and, 94–98
  danger to, 3–4, 19–20, 22, 31–33
  economic struggle, 35, 68–69
  education (*see* Education)
  ends and means, 63–67
  fascism rejects, 59
  intellectual freedom, 103
  intelligence and, 85–87, 95
  loyalties, 87, 98, 103
  meaning of, 67–69
  method, 60–63, 74–75
  philosophy of, 34
  political, 35
  processes, 66, 68
  social strategy for, 229–230
  system of values, 67–68
  vitality, 37, 42, 48–50
  way of life, 94
Democratic party, 56, 61
Democratic Way of Life, 53–54
Dennis, Lawrence, *Coming American Fascism*, 63
Denver, 186–187
Depression, of 1929, 6, 23–25, 32, 178–179
  periods of, 19, 22, 24, 30
  threat to democracy, 22
Dewey, John, 8, 12–14, 85, 111, 196, 227
  experimental school, 106
Dictatorship, fascist, 61, 210, 228
  of proletariat, 58, 62, 64, 209
Dictatorship in the Modern World, 61
Discipline, intellectual, 123

Distribution, instruments of, 56, 73, 96
Dole, 218–219
Dutch, in New World, 40

E

Economic crisis, 29–31
Economic equality, loss of, 30
Economic individualism, 18, 21, 26, 30, 50, 57
  trend from, 28–29, 95–96
  (*See also* Capitalism)
Economic nationalism, 57
Economic power, 53–54, 69
Economic security, 30–33, 48, 52, 69, 224
Economy, problem of control, 25, 28–38, 55, 95–96
"Economy of abundance," 47
Education, administration (*see* Administration of education)
  attempts to control, 5–6
  conflicts, 87–88
  control of, 81–82, 126–149
    financial, 129, 156–161, 177
    local and lay, 130–132, 157–160, 163, 167–168
    social, 4, 81–82, 126–149, 156–161, 168–170, 177
  democracy in, 98–100
  for democracy in our time, 4, 11–17, 38, 67, 81–125, 215–218
    culture, 96–98, 116, 211
    social program, 93–96
  duty to social order, 212
  equal opportunity, 157, 224
  as experience, 215
  Federal aid to, 156–161, 166–168, 184, 186, 200
  without Federal control, 161–164, 166–168
  four points of view, 205–218
  future of democracy and, 228–230
  general, 107–109
Education, indoctrination, 100–103
  national systems, 4
  neutralization, 88, 93
  philosophy of, 11
  political purpose, 7, 88–93
  pressures upon, 5–6, 88
  progressive (*see* Progressive education)
  schools of, 7, 227
  scientific movement, 9–12
  as social policy, 203–218
  a social process, 211–215
  social purposes of, 5, 7–9, 15–17, 88–93, 178
  social revolution and, 5
  state support for, 157, 177
  study of, 179
  of teachers, 225–228
  theories of, 124
  unique function, 127–130
  for work, 108–109
  (*See also* Schools)
Elementary schools, 6, 44, 104–109, 112–113, 118, 120, 151
Embargoes, 75
England, 19, 24, 40, 45, 61
  institutions transplanted, 39–40
  political democracy, 21
  Revolution in, 111
  schools in, control, 132
  (*See also* Great Britain)
Entrepreneurs, 20–21, 30, 37, 104
Equality, as foundation of liberty, 52–53
  interpretation of, 150
  of opportunity, 150–170
    educational, 151–154, 168–170, 200
Evolution, Tennessee statute, 5
Experience, education as, 215–218
Experimental schools, 13, 106
Experimentalism, 14

F

Fabian socialist party, 61
Factory system, 21, 53

Farm, self-contained, 71
specialization on, 26
Farm machinery, 18, 23
Farmer-labor parties, 76
Farmers, 8, 30, 37
tenant, 27–28
Farmers' organizations, 31, 48–49, 63, 96, 136, 186, 192–193, 201
Fascism, 11, 32–34, 49–50, 59–61, 63, 102, 180
danger of, in United States, 74–75, 138, 163
in education, 5, 204
states, 28, 66, 82, 209
Federal Constitution, 130
Federal Office of Education, 164, 167
Federal Trade Commission, 26
Federalists, 32
Feudalism, 20, 206
Florida, 40
Folklore of Capitalism, 20
Ford, Guy Stanton, 61
Ford, Henry, 29
Ford production line, 23
Foreign relations, 78–80
Forest resources, 72
Forum, 49
Foundations, 198–199
France, 19, 40
schools in, 4, 82, 88, 132, 163, 166
Franco, 79, 220
Franklin, Benjamin, 89, 104–105, 227
Free competition, 21–22, 25, 54–55
Free market, 21–22, 24–25, 55
Free schools, 5–7, 81
battle for, 81, 175–176, 187–189
education for democracy, 93
social purpose, 88–93
Free trade, 25
Freedom, of assembly, 21, 61, 74, 80, 98
of press, 21, 49, 61, 65, 80, 89, 98, 212–214
Freedom, of speech, 21, 49, 65, 67, 74, 80, 98, 209, 212–214
of teaching, 6, 80, 141, 177, 180–182, 185, 200, 210, 212
Freeman, Frank N., 11
Frontier, 91
closing of, 8, 43, 132
schools, 131
for democracy, 41

G

Galileo, 206
Gellerman, William B., 75
General education, 107–109
General Motors, 27
Germans, 42
Germany, 4, 19, 24, 33, 40, 49, 79–80
chemistry in, 45
Gymnasium, 113
republic, 58, 65
schools in, 82, 88
Third Reich, 19, 59, 191, 204
Volkschule, 112–113
Gideonse, Harry D., 207–208
Glass, Carter, 76
Graduate schools, for administrators, 7, 149
of education, 225, 227
Great Britain, 61, 88, 132, 163, (*See also* England)
Greek city state, 67–68
Greenback movement, 32
Guild socialists, 57
Guild system, 20–21

H

Hacker, *United States—A Graphic History*, 36
Hague, Frank, 75
Hague machine, 130
Hall, G. Stanley, 8
Handicrafts, 18, 21, 71
Hanna, Paul R., 122–123

Harris, William T., 8, 227
Hartmann, George, 15
Hayes, Carlton, 82
Hebrews, 67
Hegel, 208
High schools, 6, 106–109, 116–117, 151–153, 160
  curriculum of, 121
  teaching in, 113
History, study of, 119–120
Hitler, 4, 19, 65, 210
Holding companies, 30
Home, 92
Hoover, Herbert, 76
Hours and wages, 77, 223
Housing, 56, 123, 180, 193, 223
Huguenots, 40
Hungary, 43
Hutchins, President Robert M., 204, 207

I

Illinois, 156
Immigration, 39–40, 42–44, 91
  restricted, 43
Imperialism, 57
Income, national, 52, 168, 179, 216
Income tax, Colorado, 186–189, 193
Individual, 34, 60, 83, 98, 115
Individualism, economic (*see* Capitalism)
Indoctrination, 15, 88, 93, 100–103, 195, 212, 222
Industrial Revolution, 7, 18–19, 21, 23, 53, 104
Industrial workers, 21–22, 190
Industry, freedom from control, 20–21
  science in, 9
  unemployment and, 23
Institute of Public Opinion, 37–38
Insurgent America, 38
Intelligence, 85–88
Intelligence tests, 9–10
Interest groups, 134–138, 219, 229
International, Second, 58
  Third or Communist, 58
International trade, 19, 33
Interstate Commerce Commission, 26
Iowa, 156
  University of, 169
Irish, 42
Isolation, 79–80
Italy, 4, 33, 43, 49, 79
  fascism in, 59, 191
  schools of, 82, 88

J

Jackson, Andrew, 25–26, 32, 56
James, William, 8, 12, 111, 227
Japan, 19, 221
Jefferson, Thomas, 7, 25, 31–32, 37, 56, 89, 104, 227
Jersey City, 49, 75, 130
Junior college, 109, 116–117

K

Keynes, J. M., 73
Kilpatrick, William H., 15
Kohn, Hans, 61
Ku Klux Klan, 75

L

La Follette, Robert, 76
La Follette, Robert Marion, 9
La Follette family, 32
La Follette investigations, 74–75
La Guardia, Fiorello, 48
Labor, 8, 21–22, 43, 56, 123
  organized, 31, 48, 96, 135–136, 142, 186, 190–193, 196
Labor parties, 61, 76
Labor-saving machines, 23, 30, 45
Labor unions, 57, 63, 65, 191, 196–197, 201

Laissez faire, 20, 60, 178, 214
Land, 24, 72
Land grants, for education, 131, 135, 157
Lay control of education, 130–132
Leadership, educational, 137–138, 174, 179, 185–189, 222
Legislation, business regulation, 26, 71
  social, 48
Leisure class, 94
Liberal party, needed, 76–78, 80–81
Liberalism, 3, 15, 21, 61, 70, 79, 89, 196, 209, 216, 229
Liberty, problem of, 52–54
Liberty and Equality, 53
Libraries, 99, 106
Lincoln School, 119
Linville, Dr. Henry, 196
Lippmann, Walter, 70–72
Lobbies, 173, 177
Local control of education, 130–132, 157–160, 163, 167–168
Local government, 40, 48
Loeb, Harold, 46–47
Long, Huey, 32, 75
Louisiana, 40
Loyalties, 85–88
Loyalty oaths, 6, 136, 175, 177, 184
Lundberg, Ferdinard, 26, 36
Lutherans, 40
Lynd, Robert S., and Helen M., 36, 169

M

Machinery, 7, 21
  labor-saving, 23, 30, 46
McMurrys, 8
Madison, James, 55, 89, 92
Magna Carta, 40
Manhood suffrage, 21, 54, 90
Mann, Horace, 5, 7, 37, 90–91, 227
Manufacture, 18, 20–21
Markets, free, 21–22, 24–25, 55
Marx, Karl, 31
  theory of, 57–58, 61, 191, 210
Marxian parties, 76
Maryland, 40
Mass production, 23, 45–46
Maverick, Maury, 76
Mead, George, 74
Means, Gardiner C., 26–27, 71
Mennonites, 40
Mercantilism, 20–21
Mergers, 24, 30
Method, democratic, 60–63, 74–75
  of education, 98, 116, 214, 225–226
  scientific and statistical 10, 123, 227
Michigan, University of, 154
Middle class, 21–22, 32, 36–38, 63, 104, 136, 191
  fascism and, 60
Middletown, 169
Milwaukee, 23
Minerals, 24, 45, 72, 77
Minimum-wages-and-hours laws, 77
Minnesota, 43
Minorities, 127, 137
Mississippi, 158
Mississippi Valley, 45
Monopolies, 21–22, 26, 30, 56
Mooney, William B., 186
Morgan, J. E., 91
Mortgages, farm, 28
Moscow, 58
Munich, 78
Municipal utilities, 56, 61
Mussolini, 60, 79, 229

N

National Association of Manufacturers, 135
National Chamber of Commerce, 182
National Education Association, 161, 176–177, 182, 193–194, 197, 202, 214
National Guard, 75

National income, 46–47, 52, 168, 179, 216
National Resources Committee, 153
National Youth Administration, 153, 167
Nationalism, 4, 78, 81–82
National resources, 19, 44–45, 72–73, 179
Navigation laws, 21
Nazis, 5, 65
Nebraska, 48, 157
Negroes, 43
Neutrality, 217–222
Neutrality Act, 79
Nevada, 158
New Deal, 56
New England, 68, 134
New Statesman and Nation, 73
New York City, 48, 130, 196–197
New York State, 157–158
New York Times, 37
New Zealand, 19
Newspapers, 49, 62
Newtonian physics, 86
Nonintervention, 79
Norris, Senator, 32, 48
North Carolina, 6, 158
North Dakota, 154

O

Office of Education, 164, 167
Old-age pensions, 168, 186–187, 223
Opportunity, equality of, 150–170
Overexpansion, 22
Overproduction, appearance of, 22
Ownership, 26–29, 56–57
  private, 27–28, 55, 59, 73

P

Paine, Thomas, 37
Panics, 24
Parent-teacher associations, 183, 186
Parker, Francis, 8, 12–13, 106, 227
Parliamentary reform, 21
Parochial schools, 126, 162, 164–166
Parties, political, 76–78
Party line, 58, 77
Pasadena, 109
Pennsylvania, 157
Personal-property tax, 156
Personality, 67, 94
Philosophy of education, 11
Pierce, Bessie, 134
Planning, 56, 69–73, 215–218
  curriculum, 172
  economic, 70–74, 96, 214–215
  school program, 112–118
  by whom and for whom, 72
Plato, 33, 205–206, 210
Plebiscites, 60
Poland, 19, 43, 79
Political crisis, 31–33
Political democracy, 20–21, 38, 50, 57, 61, 68, 74, 104
Political education, 89
Political parties, 76–78
Popular education, 7–9, 126, 130 (*See also* Education)
Popular front party, 59
Population, stabilization of, 44
  surplus of, 24
Populist movement, 32
Post office, 61
Pragmatism, 33, 41, 86–87
President's Advisory Committee on Education, 156, 158–159, 162, 198
Press, freedom of, 21, 49, 61, 65, 80, 89, 98, 212–214
Pressure groups, 88, 93, 133–138
Private enterprise, 29, 73, 78
Private ownership, 55, 59, 73
Private schools, 126, 142, 162, 164–166
  experimental, 166
  progressive, 195
Privilege, 38, 63, 68, 94, 96, 185, 189, 200, 208, 219

Producers' cooperatives, 56
Production, buying power and, 23
factory system of, 21
instruments of, 19, 55–57, 63, 73
profits and, 22
relations of, 58
for use, 56
Professional schools, 7, 131
Professional workers, 29, 37, 191
Profits, 22, 55, 62
corporate, 23
fascism and, 59
motive, 30
planning for, 72
Progressive education, 9, 12–14, 115, 117–118, 206, 211–215, 217
Progressive Education, 212
Progressive Education Association, 12, 135, 177–178, 182, 194–195, 197, 202, 211
Progressives, 32, 49, 56, 61, 76
Propaganda, 5, 59, 66, 103, 123, 130, 208–209, 212, 217, 222–223
Psychology, 99, 227
Public education, system of, 4, 49–50, 61, 154, 166–168
Public schools, 4–7, 88–93, 195
battle for, 81, 175–176 187–189
control, 126–149
influence, 126
optimum organization, 109
public support only for, 164–166
(*See also* Education; Schools)
Public works, 56, 77
Puritans, 40

Q

Quakers, 40
Quotas, 33

R

Railroads, 24, 56, 77
Recreational facilities, 160
Red Rider, 5
Reforestation, 45
Regulation, of industry, 32, 55–56, 62, 71, 78, 223
Relief, 161, 178, 186–187, 218
Representative government, 68
Republican party, 56, 61
Research, 10–11, 46, 99
Resources, natural, 19, 44–45, 72–73, 179
Revolution, 57, 59, 62
American, 4, 20–21, 37, 104
English, 111
French, 20–21
right of, 74, 229
after World War, 19
Rocky Mountain News, 187–189
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 32, 37, 48
Roosevelt, Theodore, 9, 12, 32
quoted, 67–68
Rugged individualism, 41
Rural schools, 155
Russell, James, E., 8, 92
Russell, William F., 53
Russia, 43, 45, 49, 191
communism in, 5, 28, 58–59, 209–210
dictatorship and democracy, 65–66, 209
revolution, 3–4, 19, 58
schools, 82, 88

S

Scandinavians, 40, 42–43, 73
Scholarship of teacher, 124, 225, 227
School, as community, 122, 154–156
program, planning, 112–118
social program for, 104–125
School districts, 131, 156
Schools, authoritarian states, 67
boards of trustees, 63
business practices of, 139, 147
consolidation of, 131–133

Schools, elementary (*see* Elementary schools)
experimental, 13
fascism and, 60
free (*see* Free schools)
frontier, 131
growth of, 6–7
high (*see* High schools)
public (*see* Public schools)
rural, 155
secondary (*see* Secondary schools)
(*See also* Education)
Schurz, Carl, 42
Science, 3, 9, 45, 85–87, 91, 104–105, 111, 120
Scientific method, 10, 123, 227
Scientific movement in education, 9–12
Secondary schools, 6, 104–105, 112–113, 118, 120, 151
Securities Exchange Commission, 26
Security, proposals for, 54–60
Simon, 10
Skills, 83–84, 97, 120
intellectual, 117
social, 100
Slovaks, 43
Smith, Adam, 54
Smith, Eugene Randolph, 212
Smith, T. V., 53–54
Smith Brothers, 23
Smith-Hughes Law, 162
Social democracy, 50
frontier and, 41–42
Social education, nature of, 82–85, 100
subject matter and activities, 109–112, 168
Social legislation, 48, 78
Social reconstruction, education for, 69–70
Social sciences, 119–120
Social security, 44, 78, 193, 223
Social services, 56, 77–78, 168
Socialism, 5, 28, 33, 55–60, 73, 76, 102, 223
Socialist parties, 49, 61–62
Socialist state, Russian, 19
Spain, 79–80, 220
Spanish-American War, 9
Speculation, 22
Speech, freedom of, 21, 49, 65, 67, 74, 80, 98, 209, 212–214
Stalin, 59
Standard of living, 46, 162
State, communism and, 58
fascism and, 60
State socialism, 33
States, commissions, 26
schools, control, 130–131, 162–166
support, 156–167, 200
Steam engine, 18
Stoddard, Professor George, 169
Subsidies, 24
Subsistence grants, 154, 160, 200
Suffrage, manhood, 21, 54, 90
Supreme Court, 48, 111, 119, 166
Syndicalists, 57

T

Tammany, 130
Tariff, 25, 33
Taxation, education, 156–161
redistribution of wealth, 222
for schools, 131
Taylor, John, of Caroline, 25
Teacher-training institutions, 200, 225
Teachers, administration and, 143–146
civic responsibilities, 172–175, 199
democracy, work for, 200, 219–222
education, 225–228
political, 180–181, 201
social, 197, 201

Teachers, guidance, 122
leadership, 137, 174, 179, 185–189, 222
number of, 7
pressures upon, 5
scholarship of, 124–125
social change, direction, 221–222
study of education, 199–201
Teachers' colleges, 200, 225–227
Teachers' organizations, 135, 146
administration and control of education, 181
attitudes of, 193–199
collaboration with public, 182–199
form, 190–193
method, 184–189, 195
democracy, work for, 200–201
functions, 178–182
leadership, 185–189
social program for, 199–201
unity, need for, 201–202
Teaching, canons, 171
freedom of (*see* Freedom, of teaching)
redirection, 121
regulation, 173
Teaching profession, leadership, 179, 185–189
organization, 175–178
social program for, 171–202
Technological unemployment, 22–23
Technology, 3, 9, 18, 30, 43, 78, 86, 92, 108, 190
Telephones, 46
Tennessee, 5
Textile machinery, 18
Thompson machine, 130
Thorndike, 10
Thought, crisis in, 33–35
Tory socialism, 78
Totalitarian state, 59
Town meetings, 68, 147
Trade, world, 19, 33
Trade unionism, 57, 65, 191
Traditions, American, conflicting, 50–51
Trusts, 22
Tuition fees, 152–153, 162
Turner, Frederick J., 41

U

Underconsumption, 22
Unemployment, 23, 37, 123, 178–179, 218, 224
technological, 22–23
Unemployment insurance, 223
Unions, 57, 63, 65, 191, 196–197, 201
United States, collectivism in, 28
economic system, present, 25–26
mass production, 23, 45–46
national income, 46–47, 52, 168, 179, 216
resources, natural, 24, 44–45
political and educational, 47–50
technology, 45–47, 50
traditions, 50–51
United States—A Graphic History, 36
United States bank, 25, 32
United States Chamber of Commerce, 135, 184
Universities, 6–7, 9, 109, 123–124, 152–153, 168, 226, 228
administration, 139, 141–142
schools of education, 200
state, 6, 131
University of Chicago, 119
Urbanization, 18, 91
Utilities, 26, 32, 56, 61

V

Versailles, Treaty of, 19
Vocational education, 107–109
Voting, 53–54, 66, 90

W

Wage earners, 29–31, 53, 63, 75
Wages, 22–23, 29–31, 77, 196, 223
Washington, George, 89
Wealth, concentration of, 22, 24, 31, 216
  distribution, 27, 29
  redistribution, 223
Webb, Beatrice, 65
Webb, Sidney, 65
West, 24, 44, 91, 109
  agrarian revolt, 32
White-collar workers, 29, 37 136, 190–191
Williams, Roger, 40
Wilson, Woodrow, 9, 32
Wisconsin, 43, 48, 76
Women in industry, 77
Workers, 58, 90, 142
  industrial, 21–22, 190
  insecurity of, 96
  right of, to collective bargaining, 77
  unemployed, 23–24
World War, 4–6, 11, 18–19, 22, 43, 176

Y

Yardstock principle, 56
Youth Serves the Community, 122–123

Z

Zoning, 72

BIBLIOTEKA NAUKOWA
WAP
34084/
2.